

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 595

HE 015 016

TITLE The 1980-1981 General College Retention Program, Final Report.

INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General Coll.

PUB DATE Jan 82

NOTE 156p.; Not available in paper copy due to poor reproducibility.

AVAILABLE FROM University of Minnesota, General College, Minneapolis, MN 53455.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Academic Persistence; American Indians; Ancillary School Services; Black Students; *College Students; *Developmental Studies Programs; Dropout Prevention; Higher Education; *High Risk Students; Individualized Instruction; Language Skills; Latin Americans; Learning Modules; Mexican Americans; *Minority Groups; Pilot Projects; Program Costs; Program Evaluation; *Writing Instruction

IDENTIFIERS General College Pilot Education Program; *University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Three papers pertaining to the General College Pilot Education Program (PEP), a retention effort undertaken by the General College, University of Minnesota, are presented. In "An Overview of the General College PEP Program in Its Second Year," C. P. Zanoni addresses the components of the program, evaluation efforts, and program costs. The PEP program is an academic support-service designed to assist, encourage, and retain high-risk students. The program consists of three individualized PEP packages, each of which is designed to meet the academic and support service needs of a particular ethnic or racial minority group. The components of the three PEP packages (American Indian, Chicano/Latino, and black) consist of integrated educational modules. The academic plan consists of skills development courses (language modules), subject matter modules, support services, and individualized course assistance. In "The Second Year of the General College PEP Program: A Curriculum Experiment for Underprepared Minority Students," John L. Romano and Joan B. Garfield, indicate that the overall retention rate of PEP students increased from 59 percent in 1979-80 to 70 percent in 1980-81. A demographic profile of entry-level students enrolled in the 1980-81 PEP program, along with their academic achievement, and the progress of 1979-80 students who continued or dropped out of the university are addressed. In "Teaching Writing in the PEP III Package," April Knutson discusses requirements of the PEP writing courses and the outcomes of the course with black students. Course listings and program costs for 1980-81 are appended. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *

* from the original document. *

ED216595

FINAL REPORT

PILOT EDUCATION program

1980
1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

General College
Univ of Miami

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

The 1980 - 1981
GENERAL COLLEGE RETENTION PROGRAM

Final Report

January, 1982

Acknowledgement

Special thanks is owed to Professor Alex Kurak for his expert editorial assistance and constructive suggestions concerning the structure and content of this report, and to Charlene Allert for seeing the entire project through to its completion.

HE 015 012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
An Overview of the General College PEP Program in Its Second Years C.P. Zanoni	1
The Second Year of the General College PEP Program: A Curriculum Experiment for Underprepared Minority Students John L. Romano Joan B. Garfield	16
Teaching Writing in the PEP III Package April Knutson	90

Appendices

Appendix A: PEP Package: Course Listings, 1980-81

Appendix B: Summary of PEP Costs, 1980-81

Introduction

The origin in the fall of 1979 of the General College Pilot Education Program (PEP)¹ as a part of the General College's retention effort and the development of the program during the 1979-80 academic year was described in Pilot Education Programs: Final Report, 1979-80 published in the fall of 1980. Since the time of that report, the PEP program has continued to develop as a special student academic program in the General College. This report, the second in a series, covers the operation of the PEP program from the fall of 1980 through June, 1981.

The General College PEP program is an academic support-service designed to assist, encourage and retain so-called "high risk" student populations. Most students enrolled in the PEP program were recruited by the University of Minnesota's Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs (OMSSA) and attended OMSSA's Summer Institute prior to enrolling in the General College PEP Program fall quarter, 1980.

Partial financial support for the PEP program during the 1980-81 academic year was obtained by the General College through OMSSA from a special allocation to the University of Minnesota from the Minnesota Legislature. Funding for the 1980-81 academic year was designated by OMSSA to support PEP packages for American Indian, Chicano/Latino, and Black students. No funding for the increasing number of Asian/Pacific students (Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian and Korean) on campus was included in the 1980-81 PEP allocation. (See Conclusions and Recommendations)

¹For convenience in this report, the acronym "PEP" is used in both "PEP program" and "PEP package." The "PEP program" is the total General College retention program; "PEP package" refers to the individual parts of the whole program. "PEP I" designates the package for American Indians; "PEP II" refers to the Chicano/Latino package; and "PEP III" denotes the package for Black students.

In accepting financial support from the University for the continuation of the PEP program in its second year, the General College assumed an obligation to account accurately for the manner in which the funds were spent and to demonstrate that such expenditures were in accordance with the University's and the Legislature's general understanding of the purpose and objectives of a student retention program. What follows in fulfillment of the College's obligation, is a report on the General College PEP program, including a description of the program's components, an evaluation of its operation, and a specification of the program's costs through spring quarter, 1981.

Program Description

The General College PEP program consists of three individualized PEP "packages" each of which is designed to meet the academic and support-service needs of a particular ethnic or racial minority group. The components of the three PEP packages--American Indian, Chicano/Latino, and Black--consist of integrated educational modules designed to be relevant to the particular characteristics of the students in each of the PEP groups.² Each package is a three-quarter (i.e., a full academic year) academic plan consisting of four components, as follows:

1) Skills Development Courses. These are language modules, constituting an intensive and comprehensive program of study devised to improve the reading, writing and speaking skills of students. These modules make up the central focus of each of the PEP packages for two reasons: a) because students enrolled in the PEP program are those who display weaknesses in fundamental skills; b) because the language units

²Other non-PEP General College students who are "members of groups which have been historically underrepresented in higher education and are clearly below the national average on economic and educational indices" are encouraged to enroll in the General College TRIO program, a federally funded project. The TRIO program thus consists of many students who are not members of the traditional minority groups. See Sherry Read's TRIC/ Special Services Program Evaluation: Final Report, 1980-81 (University of Minnesota, General College, 1981).

covered are those which provide the student with the enabling skills necessary for continued success in doing college-level coursework.

2) Subject matter modules. These are subject matter classes that focus on the cultural values of each ethnic and/or racial group. Course materials include topics from both literature and the social sciences; examples are such courses as Issues in American Indian Education (PEP I), Contemporary Chicano Issues (PEP II), and Afro-American Literature (PEP III). Courses of this type are designed and taught by ethnic instructors and are intended to give the student a sense of cultural identity and pride.

3) Support Services. A whole range of support services are made available to students enrolled in the PEP program. Such services include tutorial assistance, "survival" information (economic, social and educational), career planning, and individual counseling and advising. Ethnic tutors, advisors, and counselors are used wherever possible.

4) Individualized Course Assistance. Depending upon the individual's program needs and academic requirements, space in special sections of various General College subject matter courses are set aside for PEP students. Thus, for example, places in various sections of mathematics and science courses are reserved for PEP students. Although these courses are taught by non-PEP members of the General College teaching staff, special tutorial and support mechanisms are instituted to attend to the needs of PEP students enrolled in such classes. (For a complete list of courses in each of the three PEP packages, see "PEP Packages" appended.)

The effectiveness of teaching and counseling in the PEP program was assured during 1980-81 by the coordinate efforts of each PEP package "teaching team." Each of the teams met regularly, often on a weekly

basis, to set common principles, policies and procedures for the teaching and support services in each of the packages. Problem students or students with excessive absences were immediately identified by members of the team. Through joint efforts by team members, techniques were devised and decisions made to resolve any difficulties that arose. In cases in which the facts warranted, individual students were counseled out of the PEP program, either by "mainstreaming" them, by transferring them to the TRIO program, or by recommending that they drop out of the University until such time as they are able to give sufficient commitment to the academic responsibilities required of the PEP program.

During the fall, 1980, quarter only, the PEP program continued its practice of deliberately "sheltering" each of the PEP package students, not only from each other but also from the University student body in general. For select students, a gradual integration into the general student body began as early as winter quarter (1981), although most students did not begin such integration until the spring quarter. During the 1981-82 academic year, ethnic members of the three teaching teams are devising a team-taught, inter-racial, capstone course to bring all students in the PEP packages together. Such a course will be available for PEP students as early as the spring quarter, 1982.

The 1980-81 version of the PEP program showed an increase over the previous year in the number of ethnic instructors, counselors, peer advisors, and teaching assistants for each of the PEP package modules. Members of the General College's administration, Directors of the University's Learning Resource Centers,³ and members of the teaching teams continued to

³The four University Learning Resource Centers are OMSSA funded, all-university support service units for the various ethnic and/or racial minority group students on campus. The names of the Centers and the directors of each are as follows:

American Indian Learning Resource Center (Flo Wiger)
Black Learning Resource Center (Vera Rorie)
Juarez/Humphrey Chicano/Latino Supportive Services Center (Luis Aguilar)
Asian/Pacific American Learning Resource Center (Nobuya Tsuchida)

make a rigorous and conscientious effort to seek and hire, whenever possible, additional qualified ethnic personnel.

Substantial credit for the functioning and success of the PEP packages during 1981-82 is owed to the directors and staff of the University's Learning Resource Centers. Two of the directors are instructors in PEP packages; all of the four Learning Resource Center Directors are chairpersons of the respective advisory committees who coordinate the efforts of the teaching and support service teams, give direction and scope to the packages, and supervise the quality and effectiveness of the PEP packages. A significant contribution to the effectiveness of the program was also made by members of the General College HELP Center (Higher Education For Low Income People). In addition, cooperative relationships with the staff and personnel of OMSSA's Summer Institute continue to insure an orderly assignment of students from the Institute's summer program into the General College PEP program.

Program Evaluation

A comprehensive evaluation of the 1980 PEP program was conducted by General College Professors John L. Romano (Counseling and Student Development Division) and Joan B. Garfield (Science, Business and Mathematics Division). Although their report does not constitute a definite evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the College's retention program--an assessment that can only be made over the total length of each PEP student's enrollment in the University--it does, nevertheless, indicate that the overall retention rate of students in the 1980-81 PEP program increased significantly over that of the 1979-80 PEP program: a 70% retention rate in 1980-81 versus a 59% retention rate in 1979-80. (The largest factor in this increased retention rate was a doubling of the retention rate--from 42% to 88%-- in the American Indian PEP package.) There appear to be several reasons for the general improvement in the

student retention rate. First, students in the 1980-81 program have slightly better academic backgrounds than those in the 1979-80 program. Credit for this rests on the recruitment efforts of OMSSA and the Learning Resource Centers. Second, each of the packages has been refined to include only those courses, methods of instruction, and kinds of support services that have proved themselves effective in meeting the academic needs of the students. Third, each of the teaching teams is composed of instructors who have a special commitment to the objectives of the program, who have proved themselves competent and effective as educational mentors, and who have the desire and ability to cooperate effectively with the instructors, counselors and advisory committee members that comprise the package team. The addition of ethnic and/or racial minority instructors and the continuity of members of the team encourages students to identify closely with the aims and objectives of the retention program.

This 1980-81 evaluation of the PEP program includes two features not included in the 1979-80 evaluation report. The two features added to this evaluation consist of 1) a follow-up study of the 1978-80 "mainstreamed" PEP students who continued their educations into the 1980-81 academic year; and 2) a survey of 1979-80 PEP students who left the University for whatever reasons. Thus the 1980-81 PEP evaluation is composed of the following parts:

1. A demographic profile of entry-level students enrolled in the 1980-81 PEP program. Included here are such items of information as high school background, percentile rank and scores on placement tests, students academic plans and aspirations and sources of academic funding.

2. An evaluation of PEP students in terms of the traditional measures of academic success: Grade point averages (GPA), credit completion ratios (CCR), and an analysis of the kinds and success rate in the various courses taken.
3. Retention rates for students in both the 1979-80 and 1980-81 programs, quarter by quarter and in comparison with a control group.
4. The academic progress of "mainstreamed" 1979-80 PEP students and their personal estimation and evaluation of the program.
5. A follow-up study of the 1979-80 PEP students who dropped out of the University and an analysis of their reasons for doing so.

Since accurate retention data for individual American Indian, Chicano/Latino and Black students within the General College and within the University as a whole are not available, it is difficult to ascertain the precise significance of the statistics referring to retention rates for students in the PEP program. However, the information contained in the 1980-81 evaluation report confirms the belief of those involved in the program that the PEP package concept is an effective mode of instruction for the General College retention program. In addition, the nature, scope and content of the evaluation is evidence that the PEP program's measurement instruments are adequate to assess the impact of the total PEP program on student retention.

Even though PEP students generally have weaker academic backgrounds and face greater social and economic difficulties than non-PEP students, the 70% retention rate for entry-level PEP students for the first year is identical to that of the retention rate of the overall General College

student body. On the other hand, the retention rate of second-year, "mainstreamed" PEP students shows a larger decrease than that of the general student body. Thus, for example, while 50% of the 1979-80 PEP students re-enrolled for 1980-81 classes, only 30% satisfactorily completed the second year. For non-PEP students in their second year, the rate is approximately 37% satisfactory completion. This difference between the retention rates of PEP students and other General College students can be accounted for by two factors. First, social and economic factors--especially financial--impose an enormous burden on PEP students. Second, it is obvious that, for many of the second-year PEP students, the lack of support services, especially tutorial assistance and advising, is an academic handicap. The problems of second-year retention of PEP students is of serious concern to PEP planners. Providing necessary assistance for second-year students is difficult, since PEP funds granted to the General College by OMSSA are designated only for first-year, entry-level students. To meet this problem, PEP planners are considering alternative strategies and searching for alternative sources of funds in order to provide for the needs of second-year PEP students.

Some of the strengths and weaknesses of the PEP program mentioned in the evaluation include the following. Seventy six percent of the students mentioned the program itself as contributing to their academic success; 52% rated the teaching and modes of instruction in the program positively. On the other hand, 70% of the students considered advising to be weak. Perhaps the most significant weakness of the PEP program can be attributed to an image problem. That is, many members of the University community have a generally negative perception and/or misconception of the role and function of the General College in the University. General College students generally suffer from this problem within the University and PEP students, because they are aware that they are treated differently from students in the "mainstream," suffer a double image problem. Fortunately,

thanks to the effective advising and counseling of the staff members of the Learning Resource Centers during 1981-82, newer PEP students are beginning to develop a more positive view of the PEP program. In short, the message is now getting through to these students that being in the PEP program is a privilege and not an imposition. As to the image of the General College itself, since there is now greater dissemination of accurate information about the role and function of the General College, there is good reason to believe that, both within the University and in the community at large, more positive attitudes are evolving.

PEP planners believe that the kinds of problems identified in the 1980-81 evaluation can be readily addressed as the PEP program continues to develop. Careful advising of students and monitoring of their progress is the key; special efforts in these areas are being made during the 1981-82 academic year.

Program Costs

When the General College was granted \$52,000 of OMSSA funds for the 1980-81 PEP program, the administration of the College was aware that this amount was not sufficient to finance a complete retention program for students from ethnic and minority groups. Experience has shown that instructional costs in such a program are high. An effective program requires the hiring of a qualified ethnic/racial staff. Since such staff members must develop and teach appropriate courses and participate in weekly team meetings, as well as advise and assist individual students in the program, they must be paid at a rate that is above that of other part-time teaching associates in the University. The need for staff members with special expertise--tutors, teaching assistants, and peer advisors--increased the PEP program's costs beyond those of other established programs in the College. In short, in order to plan, staff and implement an effective PEP program, the General College found it necessary to commit

from its own meager resources a substantial amount beyond that granted to it by OMSSA.

Given the fiscal condition of the General College in 1980-81, the financial resources available to the College for the PEP program had to be severely curtailed. The reason for this curtailment of College funds for the PEP program was the implementation, during the 1980-81 academic year, of a comprehensive retention program for Asian/Pacific students (mainly Indochinese refugees). The number of such students in the General College has in recent years shown a dramatic increase. Because such students need special academic and support service, the General College felt a strong obligation to expand its retention efforts to include Asian/Pacific students. To fund a new Asian/Pacific program while at the same time providing College funds for the continuing PEP program was beyond the financial capability of the General College. In order to deal with this financial exigency, the College adopted two courses of action. First, wherever possible and without diminishing the effectiveness of the PEP program, teaching and support service components of the PEP program were incorporated into the established General College teaching, advising and counseling functions. Second, in order to mount the Asian/Pacific retention program, the College channeled whatever scarce resources were available from its own budget and made an effort to secure the additional funds from various outside sources. In the latter effort, the College was somewhat successful. Additional funds were obtained from an EDP grant, from petitioning the University's central administration for assistance and (with the cooperation of Dr. Nobuya Tsuchida, Director of the Asian/Pacific Learning Resource Center) from the State Department of Public Welfare. Thus, with the aid of General College funds and funds obtained from outside sources, the General College was able to continue the PEP program and to mount a new Asian/Pacific retention program.

Since funds from outside sources are non-recurring, and because the General College had reached the absolute limit of its ability to support two retention programs, it was obvious in 1981 that without the assistance of OMSSA funds in the future, a retention program for Asian/Pacific students beyond the 1980-81 academic year would have to be drastically curtailed or eliminated. Fortunately, for the 1981-82 academic year OMSSA granted the General College Asian/Pacific retention program partial funding. (See Asian Commanding English Program: Final Report, 1980-81, forthcoming.)

The need for funds for the PEP program and for the Asian/Pacific retention program beyond that provided by OMSSA and external sources was met by Dean Jeanne T. Lupton's diversion of \$33,000 of reallocation funds returned to the General College from the University's 1978-79 retrenchment. (Since these funds were returned to the College for its skills development and retention efforts, this diversion of funds into the PEP and Asian/Pacific programs was in accordance with the conditions specified in the reallocation.) In addition to this dollar amount, the College's commitment to the two retention programs also included underwriting all costs for administering the programs; for budgetary accounting; for package and course evaluations; and for supplies, materials, typing and secretarial services. Thus, every cent of designated funds--reallocation and external--was expended for purely academic and support-service functions.

Appended to this report is a "Summary of PEP Costs: 1980-81," a detailed account of the General College PEP program expenditures through spring quarter, 1981. This summary should be viewed in the context of a fact mentioned earlier in this report: economies achieved in the original PEP program was the principal reason that the General College was able to divert funds to mount a comprehensive and effective retention program for Asian/Pacific students.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Viewed at this point (Winter, 1982) the PEP program seems to be working: the administrative machinery is functioning smoothly; ethnic/racial instructors, counselors and assistants have been assimilated into the program; the individual PEP package staff members have melded into cohesive, effective teaching teams; and cooperative relationships with the various University Learning Resource Centers have been instituted.

With respect to the future of the program, some points have already been mentioned. By a more stringent monitoring of student progress, by more persuasive and effective counseling and advising, and by more efficient tutorial service, problems in the PEP program can be solved as they arise. If there is an element lacking in the program, it is the absence of a career-planning module in each of the packages. Plans are currently underway to introduce appropriate ethnic-centered career development modules into each of the PEP packages. Plans are also underway to develop a "third-world perspective" cultural course that could bring all PEP students together in one course, a course team-taught by members selected from each of the three PEP packages. Experience thus far has also shown that a part of the General College retention program that requires continuing attention and an increased commitment is the monitoring of "mainstreamed" PEP students, and, perhaps, continued assistance for them. Although not part of the original design of the PEP program, continued assistance is nevertheless an important element in carrying out the specified purpose of a retention program. Accordingly, special attention will be given to "mainstreamed" PEP students in 1982, and attempts will be made to extend to these students whatever aid and assistance they need.

In summary, it can be said that many lessons have been learned in the first two years of the PEP program's existence: where necessary,

changes have been made, and they will continue to be made to meet the ever-increasing and varied academic and support-service needs of PEP students--those within the program--former PEP students, and those that have been "mainstreamed".

PEP planners and members of the teaching teams are convinced of the efficacy of the PEP program as an academic retention model; they no longer consider the PEP program a pilot program. Accordingly, the new name for the PEP program, beginning with the 1981-82 academic year, is "Personalized Educational Program" instead of "Pilot Education Program."

Notwithstanding the level of success in general, there are some conditions over which the General College has little or no control but which nevertheless have a direct bearing on the success or failure of future PEP offerings. These factors include recruitment, student financial aid, and program costs.

Recruitment. It is a truism that the stronger the academic background and motivation of students, the better their chances are of academic success and retention within the University. Since the General College does not recruit its own PEP students, it is essential that OMSSA recruiters for the PEP program seek out the best qualified learners available. Although a high school diploma or a GED certificate are not necessary for students to be admitted to the General College, it nevertheless seems advisable to screen potential PEP students carefully with respect to their academic preparation. There is a threshold of academic underpreparedness; the General College has neither the personnel nor the financial resources to carry on an academic program for students below a certain level of preparedness.

Student Financial Aid. Most students registered in the PEP program received some form of financial aid and could not continue their schooling without such assistance. It is imperative that financial aid agreements

with individual students be finalized early enough each quarter so that PEP planners can count on their attendance for the ensuing quarter.

It is equally imperative that PEP students continuing in the University beyond the first year be granted continued financial aid. Our survey of second-year students shows conclusively that the lack of financial aid was the greatest impediment to students continuing their education.

Program Costs. It seems obvious that the General College retention program--of which the PEP program is a part--should be continued and expanded to assist ever greater numbers of minority and disadvantaged students. But the General College, with resources that can, at best, be described as meager, cannot afford any increase of expenditures for retention programs without jeopardizing its primary commitment to students in its other programs. OMSSA's contribution to the General College retention program for minority students, while generous, is small in proportion to the number of such students enrolled in the General College. During the fall quarter, 1981, for example, the General College enrolled 666 minority students, a 9% increase over the previous year and fully 24% of its entire student body. Data of this kind clearly indicate that OMSSA's and the University's support of the General College retention program is not in proportion to the number of minority students involved.

With the inclusion of the General College Asian Commanding English (ACE) Program under the aegis of the PEP program, the enrollment in the PEP program doubled in 1981-82 while OMSSA financial support for the PEP program increased only 33%. PEP planners and the administration of the General College are fully aware that OMSSA funds are limited and that, in view of the current financial straits of the University, funds within the University for the purpose of student retention will be severely limited.

As a consequence, the General College, with the assistance of the Learning Resource Centers, will make a concerted effort to seek outside funds in order to maintain the quality, effectiveness and availability of its retention program. Meanwhile, it is incumbent on OMSSA and the University's Administrative Steering Committee that makes final decisions about the distribution of retention funds to review carefully the criteria and procedures for distributing retention funds throughout the University. Only those units within the University that demonstrate objectively that their retention funds were used for the purpose intended by the Legislature and only those programs that have been proven effective in student retention should be given consideration for future retention funding. The General College administration is confident that the PEP program, as demonstrated by this evaluation, will prove to be deserving of continued financial support.

To summarize, there is little doubt that there are many students in the University for whom effective retention aid is required. The plight of these students, in the General College as well as in other programs, ought to be a matter of serious concern to the central administration of the University.

The Second Year
of
The General College PEP
Program: A Curriculum Experiment
For Underprepared Minority Students

by
John L. Romano
and
Joan B. Garfield

General College
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
August 1981

Summary of Major Findings

1. After 2 years 30% of the PEP students were still enrolled at the University compared with 35% and 39% of the academically stronger control groups. PEP students, during their second year, completed fewer courses compared to the comparison groups, but had similar GPA's.
2. After 2 years none of the PEP students had transferred from GC, while 19% of the control group students had transferred.
3. The 1980 PEP students tended to have slightly better academic backgrounds prior to entering the College compared to their 1979 counterparts.
4. The 1980 PEP students had a yearly retention rate of 70% compared to 59% of the 1979 students. The American Indian students doubled their retention rate.
5. The 1980 PEP students achieved similar GPA's and completed a similar percentage of their courses compared to the 1979 students.
6. The most successful 1980 PEP students were those who: (a) had graduated from high school, (b) had at least one parent with post high school training, (c) had educational aspirations beyond the baccalaureate degree, (d) had been out of school longer than three years.
7. High school graduation, Fall quarter GPA, and Fall quarter CCR were strong predictors of how successful students would be during the remainder of the year.
8. A telephone follow-up of students revealed that most were pleased with the PEP Program, their instructors, the Learning Resource Centers, the Skills Centers, and the supportive services in General College. Areas mentioned most frequently as needing improvement were better advising and counseling and more flexibility in class selection.
9. Personal, financial, and health reasons were cited most often as reasons for withdrawing from college. Most students did not drop out for educational reasons.
10. Conclusions suggest that the PEP Program has been moderately successful over the last two years as PEP students have achieved and been retained at levels only slightly below students with stronger academic backgrounds. Greater attention needs to be given to identify appropriate students for the PEP Program and to provide extra assistance to needy PEP students throughout their stay in the College. Intensive and regular advising and counseling may help students make better career/educational decisions but not necessarily prevent their withdrawal from the University.

Introduction

During the 1979-80 academic year, the General College (GC) launched an educational program specifically designed to serve underprepared minority students entering the College. The program, referred to as PEP for "Pilot Educational Programs," had as its major goal to increase the academic achievement and retention of academically underprepared American Indian, Chicano/Latino, and Black students. The program included courses in academic skill development such as writing, reading, and mathematics, ethnically oriented classes (e.g., Afro-American Studies, The Chicano Experience, and The American Indian), and intensive counseling and advising. As students progressed through the program they were given greater flexibility in course selection to meet their individual needs. In 1980-81 a new group of freshmen PEP students started the program. While some changes were made in the 1980-81 PEP program, its goals and structure were similar to the 1979-80 program.

During the first year of PEP an extensive evaluation was conducted by Romano and Garfield (1980) to review its effectiveness as well as study the characteristics of students who entered it. This present study is an extension of the initial PEP evaluation. It includes information about:

- The academic progress and demographic characteristics of freshmen PEP students who started the program in Fall 1980.
- The relationships between particular student characteristics and academic achievement.
- The academic progress, during their second year at the University, of PEP students who started the program in Fall 1979.
- The academic progress, during their second year at the University, of the two (non PEP) control groups used for comparison in the 1979-80 evaluation.
- A telephone follow-up survey of PEP and control group drop-outs as well as academically achieving students from both the 1979-80 and 1980-81 years.

PEP Students and Comparison Groups

This study reports and compares the 1980-81 academic progress of four groups of students. They are: (1) PEP students who began the program in Fall 1979, (2) PEP students who began the program in Fall 1980, (3) non-PEP control group students who began in Fall 1979, and (4) psychology class control group students who began in Fall 1979. The PEP students are identified with their respective groups. PEP I--American Indian students, PEP II--Chicano/Latino students, and PEP III--Black students. The control groups were selected in Fall 1979 to serve as a comparison to the PEP students. The non-PEP control group consisted of GC freshmen minority students (primarily black) most of whom received

financial assistance through the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs (OMSSA). Generally these students were not part of the PEP program because their academic preparation for college was deemed strong enough so that the PEP program was not needed. The psychology class control group consisted of all GC freshmen enrolled in an introductory psychology class during Fall 1979. It was hypothesized that this group would closely resemble the typical GC freshman student.

Rather than select new control groups to serve as comparisons to the 1980 PEP students, the 1979 data from the two control groups were used.

The 1980 PEP students were identified through class instructors and class rosters. Any student who had achieved no more than 12 credits prior to Fall 1981 and was enrolled in any part of the PEP curriculum during Fall 1981 was considered to be part of the PEP program.

Data Collection and Analysis

At the end of Spring quarter 1981, University transcripts were examined for the four groups of students identified above: 1979 PEP, 1980 PEP, and the two control groups. Data were collected to determine retention rates, grade point averages (GPA), and credit completion ratios (CCR) for each quarter as well as for the academic year of 1980-81. GPA and CCR were calculated separately for three types of courses: (1) GC skills classes (e.g., 1402, 1405, 1702, etc.), (2) GC regular classes (including the ethnic classes), and (3) non-GC classes.

GPA was routinely calculated in two ways. The first way ignores all non-credit grade symbols (i.e., N, I, W), using a scale of A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1. This is a standard University calculation. However a more conservative calculation was also made with N grades included, using a scale of A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, and N=0 (I and W grades ignored).

The CCR is the percentage of credits completed and was computed by dividing the number of credits completed by all those attempted. For retention data, only those students who officially withdrew from the University (all W grades or a withdrawal notation on the transcript) were considered as College and University withdrawals.

During freshmen orientation all students completed course placement tests in reading, writing, and mathematics and also a questionnaire asking a variety of questions about their goals, parental educational background, and need for academic and personal assistance. These data were summarized for the 1980 PEP students together with high school academic information collected from the Freshmen Summary Sheet prepared by the University Admissions and Records Office.

A telephone survey was conducted during July 1981 with four types of students:

- (1) 1979 Dropouts--1979 PEP and control group students who remained registered and achieved at least marginally during 1979-80, and who either did not return to the University during 1980-81, or did not earn any credits during 1980-81.

- (2) 1980 Dropouts--1980 FEP students who did not remain registered during 1980-81 or did not earn any credits Spring 1981.
- (3) 1979 Achieving--1979 FEP and control group students who remained registered all of 1979-80 with at least marginal achievement and who remained registered all of 1980-81 with adequate achievement. Adequate achievement was defined as achieving at least a 2.00 GPA (B's included) and a 50% CCR for the 1980-81 year.
- (4) 1980 Achieving--1980 FEP students who remained registered all of 1980-81, achieved at least a 2.00 GPA (B's included) and a 50% CCR for the 1980-81 year.

The survey was conducted through semi-structured telephone interviews by the first author to elicit from students elements of GC which were most and least helpful to them academically, ideas for improved and better service, and reasons for withdrawing. Since the survey did not lend itself to quantifiable data, the major findings from the survey are presented in discussion format.

The .05 level was used to determine significance for all statistical comparisons.

Results

The results are divided into four parts. Part I focuses on FEP students who started the program in Fall 1980. Part II reports academic progress data during their second year at the University of Loth FEP and control group students who were freshmen at the beginning of Fall 1979, and Part III reports the results of the telephone survey.

Part I: 1980-81 FEP Students

Of the 79 students identified as freshmen FEP students at the beginning of Fall quarter 1980, 26 were FEP I (American Indian students), 18 were FEP II (Chicano/Latino students), and 31 were FEP III (Black students).

High School Background and GC Placement Tests

1. Table 7 reports the high school academic background of FEP I, II, and III students as well as for all FEP students combined. Out of the 79 FEP students, 64% were high school graduates, 23% were non high school graduates, and data was not available for 14%. The Chicano/Latino students had a higher percentage of high school graduates compared to the other two groups. The average high school percentile rank was at the 35th percentile for the 38 (46%) FEP students reporting a high school percentile rank. Black students had the highest average high school percentile rank (40th percentile), followed by the Chicano/Latino students (33rd percentile), and the American Indian students (29th

percentile). Compared to the 1979 PEP students, the 1980 PEP students were about equally as likely to have graduated from high school but had a higher average high school percentile rank. (Caution is needed in making comparisons since 70% of the 1979 PEP students did not report a high school percentile rank). The 1980 PEP students actually had an average high school percentile rank higher than the average GC freshman student enrolled Fall 1980 (35th vs. 32nd percentile) (Ramano, Brothen, Garfield, and Robertson, 1981).

2. Table 8 summarizes the means, standard deviations, and percentile ranks of 1980 PEP students on the GC Placement Tests. Compared to other GC students, PEP students scored in the lower quartile on the writing and mathematics tests and in the lower third on the reading test. American Indian students scored the highest on all parts of the Placement Tests with the exception of the Whole Numbers test. Black students scored lowest on all parts of the Placement Tests. Since the English test of the GC Placement Program has changed since Fall 1979, no comparisons can be made between the 1979 and 1980 PEP students. However, on the arithmetic and algebra tests the 1980 PEP students scored lower than the 1979 PEP students.

Student Survey Questionnaire

Table 9 reports the responses of 39 PEP students who completed the GC Student Survey during Freshman Orientation. Since this represents only 49% of the total PEP students and 69% of PEP I, 56% of PEP II, and 31% of PEP III, the results from the survey need to be interpreted cautiously.

1. PEP students tended to be older than the typical GC freshman. The average age of PEP students was 23 years compared to 21 years for all GC freshmen entering Fall 1980.
2. Nearly 50% of the PEP students plan to transfer to another University of Minnesota college, while 28% are not sure of their transfer plans after GC. Only 5% of the students had plans to transfer to another college outside of the University system. While the intent to transfer is lower than the average GC freshman (73% plan to transfer to another U of M college) it is higher than the 34% of the 1979-80 PEP students who indicated as freshman that they intend to transfer.
3. Although 90% of the students indicated that they were receiving financial aid 41% indicated plans to work during the year. Another 33% were not sure. The percentage of those 1980 PEP students planning to work is lower than the 1979 PEP students (54%) and much lower than the typical GC freshman (73%).

4. For 59% of the PEP students more than one year has elapsed since they attended any school prior to enrolling in GC. This is slightly higher than the 1979 PEP students (52%) but much higher than all GC **freshmen** (39%).
5. The degree aspirations of the PEP students are high. 56% aspired to either a masters or doctorate degree. This percentage is much **higher** than for the 1979 PEP students (31%) and for all GC **freshmen** (35%).
6. Academically, PEP students felt least well prepared in math skills, musical and arithmetic skills, science, and career educational planning skills. Over 50% of the PEP students felt fairly well prepared in 8 of the 12 areas listed.
7. A high percentage of PEP students indicated a need for counseling in the following areas: financial (69%), study skills (64%), and career and educational planning (59%). Test and speech anxiety was also indicated by 28%. These areas were also the major ones indicated by 1979 PEP students and 1980 GC **freshmen**, although the percentages of the 1980 PEP students were higher.
8. At the time of **Freshman Orientation**, 38% of the PEP students were undecided about a college major and 28% either did not respond to the question or marked "other". PEP I had the most undecided students (61%) and PEP III the least (9%). None of the PEP students indicated education as a major and only 4% indicated social science or the humanities. Business, math or science, and medical science were listed by 28% of the students. The number of undecided PEP students is higher than the GC freshman group (25%). GC freshmen also indicated most often plans to major in business, math or science, and medical science (39%).
9. Parents' educational background of 1980 PEP students tended to be lower than all GC **freshmen** but similar to 1979 PEP students. 38% of the mothers and 43% of the fathers had less than a high school diploma. However, 18% of the mothers and 20% of the fathers had some type of post high school training.

Academic Achievement and Retention.

Tables 1 - 6 report the academic progress of the 1980 PEP students. The data, summarized for each PEP group individually as well as combined, include: grade point averages (GPA, calculated with and without N grades), credit completion ratios (CCR), University withdrawal and retention figures, and distribution of credits by types of courses. These data are presented for each quarter as well as for the year. Table 6 compares 1980 PEP students with the 1979 PEP students and control groups on first year GPA, CCR, and registration status. Figures 1 - 9 graphically present the comparisons. Major results from these data follow:

1. PEP students achieved an average GPA of 2.53 (N's not included) during the 1980-81 year. When GPA was calculated including N grades, GPA's were substantially lower with only PEP I during Fall quarter and PEP II during Fall, Winter, and Spring quarters showing GPA's above 2.00. Compared to the 1979 PEP students, PEP I had higher GPA's, PEP II achieved at similar levels, and PEP III showed a decrease. All 1980 PEP students combined achieved at a slightly lower (not significantly) GPA level compared to the 1979 PEP students, but higher than the 1979 non-PEP control group (with or without N's, without N's $P < .01$) and higher than the 1979 psychology class control group (without N's). Generally, GPA's showed only a slight downward trend from Fall to Spring quarters.

GPA dates for the three types of classes (GC skills, regular GC, and non-GC) showed that students achieved similarly regardless of the type of class enrolled. While relatively few students took non-GC classes, the GPA's for these classes were generally higher than in the other two groups of classes.

2. The 1980 PEP students completed 48% of their credits attempted during 1980-81. This was slightly lower (not significantly) than the 1979 PEP students and non-PEP control group, and significantly lower than the 1979 psychology class control group ($P < .01$). PEP II had the highest CCR for the year and PEP I the lowest. PEP I and II showed large decreases in CCR from Fall to Spring quarters, but PEP III showed only slight variation in CCR during the year. Compared to the 1979 PEP groups, PEP I, II, and III had similar CCR's during 1980-81. The CCR for non-GC classes was lower than for GC skills or regular classes for all PEP students combined. PEP III students, however, had a higher cumulative CCR for non-CC classes compared to GC classes.
3. Retention data showed that 96% of the PEP students remained registered during Fall quarter, 86% remained registered Winter quarter, and 75% Spring quarter. Seventy-six percent of the 70% remained registered all three quarters. These data are higher than for the 1979 PEP students when 92%, 70%, and 61% remained registered Fall, Winter, and Spring quarters respectively, and where 64% completed registration all three quarters and 59% remained registered all three quarters. (While these differences were not significant at the .05 level, the difference between 70% of the 1980 PEP students and 59% of the 1979 PEP students remaining registered all three quarters approached the 0.5 level of significance). The 1980 PEP retention figures are also higher (not significant) than for both 1979 control groups, except that 70% of the psychology class also remained registered all three quarters.

While the percentage of PEP students remaining registered was high, the percentage of those that remained registered and earned at least one passing grade decreased sharply during the year. During Fall, Winter, and Spring quarters 81%, 68%, and 51% of the PEP students remained registered and earned at least one passing grade.

Of the three PEP groups, the American Indian students had the most consistent retention data; 88% remained registered each of the three quarters. There were more withdrawals from the Chicano/Latino and Black groups as the year progressed. However, there were more Chicano/Latino and Black students who earned at least one passing grade each quarter compared to American Indian students.

Compared to the 1979 PEP groups, the 1980 American Indian students doubled their retention rate, and the 1980 Chicano/Latino and Black groups had retention rates similar to the 1979 students.

4. As the 1980-81 year progressed, PEP students registered for fewer GC skills and regular classes, while enrollment in non GC classes increased. These trends were true for all three PEP groups.

Relationships Between Academic Progress, Retention and Personal Variables.

Table 10 reports average CCR and GPA scores and retention percentages categorized by selected variables for the 39 PEP 1980 students who completed the GC Student Survey Questionnaire. Since this data is based on only 49% of the PEP students, conclusions drawn from them are tentative. A summary of Table 10 follows:

1. Males compared to females had higher CCR levels, but females tended to remain registered more than males. Females had higher GPA's (without N's) compared to males, but GPA's (with N's) were nearly identical.
2. While students 23 years old and older had lower CCR and registration rates compared to younger students, the older students achieved higher GPA's.
3. Students who have either mothers or fathers with educational training (vocational or college) beyond high school had higher CCR, GPA, and retention levels compared to students whose parents did not have such training.
4. Students who have high aspirations (a degree beyond the baccalaureate) had higher CCR, GPA, and retention levels compared to students with lower aspirations.
5. Students who indicated at Freshman Orientation that they were undecided about a college major had lower CCR and GPA (with N's) scores and were less likely to remain registered all three quarters compared to students who indicated a major.
6. Students who had been out of any school 3 years or more prior to enrolling in GC had higher CCR, GPA, and retention rates compared to students who more recently were enrolled in any school.

Table 11 reports Pearson-Product correlations between high school percentile rank, high school graduate status, GC Placement Tests, and retention, CCR, and GPA levels. The significant correlations for the 1980 PEP students follow:

1. There was a positive and significant relationship between students who were high school graduates and all five measures of academic retention and achievement. High school percentile rank, however, did not correlate significantly with any of the five measures.
2. The Reading and Writing Tests of the GC Placement Test correlated positively and significantly with cumulative GPA (without N's), while the Whole Number and Arithmetic Tests correlated positively and significantly with cumulative GPA (with N's). The Reading Test also correlated positively and significantly with continued registration. All other correlations were low and not significant.
3. Fall quarter CCR and GPA (with N's) were significantly and highly correlated with continued registration and academic progress for the remainder of the year.

Prediction equations, using multiple regression and analyses, were developed to predict cumulative CCR, GPA (without N's), and GPA (with N's). Since these analyses have not been cross-validated, they can only be considered tentative. The multiple regression equations yielded the following:

1. Fall quarter GPA (with N's) and the Reading GC Placement Test predicted 40% of the variance for cumulative CCR ($R = .63$, $P < .0001$).
2. Fall quarter CCR, and the Reading and Whole Number GC Placement Tests predicted 43% of the variance for cumulative GPA (without N's) ($R = .63$, $P < .0001$).
3. Fall quarter CCR and high school graduation status predicted 59% of the variance for cumulative GPA (with N's) ($R = .77$, $P < .0001$).

Part II: 1979 PEP and Control Groups Academic Achievement and Retention During 1980-81.

This section presents academic achievement and retention data for 1979 PEP students and the control groups during their second year at the University. (Tables 12-16 and Figures 9-11). At the beginning of Fall 1979, the following number of students were identified as comprising the various groups: PEP I - 36, PEP II - 42, PEP III - 38, non-PEP control - 86, and psychology class control - 83. Of these students, 50% of the PEP students, 59% of the non-PEP control group, and 71% of the psychology control group returned to the University for least part of 1980-81. (These data were 28% for PEP I, 57% for PEP II, and 63% for PEP III). All of the 1979 PEP

students who were enrolled during 1980-81 were enrolled in GC. Five students (6%) from the non-PEP control group and 11 students (13%) from the psychology control group transferred from CC during 1980-81. All of these transfers, except one to U of M-Morris, were to the College of Liberal Arts. Because of the difficulty in obtaining University transcripts of students not enrolled in GC, the academic records of these transferred students were not examined. One psychology control group student received the Association of Arts (AA) degree Fall 1980.

From the original group of 1979 PEP students (116), 68 students (59%) remained registered all of 1979-80 and of these 35 (30%) also registered all of 1980-81. The non-PEP control group had 55 students (64%) remain all of 1980-81. The psychology control group had 58 students remained registered for all of 1980-81. (Since the transcripts for the transferred students in the control groups were not available, they are assumed to have been registered all of 1980-81). PEP I, II, and III had 42%, 67%, and 66% remain registered all of 1979-80; of these students, 14% (PEP I), 33% (PEP II), and 42% (PEP III) remained registered all of 1980-81.

During 1980-81, 21% of the 1979 PEP students remained registered and earned at least one passing grade each quarter. This compares with 33% of the non-PEP control groups (the percentages for the control groups include all of the transferred students, having assumed that they remained registered and earned a passing grade each quarter). PEP I had 14% in this group, PEP II - 29%, and PEP III - 18%.

Additional data from Tables 12-16 are summarized.

1. Table 13 gives the withdrawal and registration rates by each quarter for 1980-81. It shows that from Fall 1980 to Spring 1981 there were 12% fewer PEP students, 7% fewer non-PEP control students, and 3% fewer psychology control students. Each of the 1979 PEP groups experienced similar withdrawal rates during 1980-81.
2. Of those students receiving GC GPA's during 1980-81, PEP students achieved a cumulative GPA of 2.42 (without N's) compared to 2.14 for the non-PEP control and 2.46 for the psychology class control group. When N grades were included in the calculation, the GPA's tended to be similar for the three groups (PEP - 1.50, non-PEP - 1.46, psychology - 1.80). Of the three PEP groups, the six PEP I students had the highest average cumulative GPA (2.05 without N's), followed by PEP II (2.49), and PEP III (2.26). With N's included in the calculation, the GPA's were reduced to 1.31 for PEP I, 1.97 for PEP II, and 1.08 for PEP III. For all three PEP groups the GPA's were higher Winter quarter compared to Fall and Spring quarters. The Winter quarter elevation was also experienced by the non-PEP control group. The cumulative GPA's of non-GC classes compared to regular

GC classes were higher for PEP and the non-PEP control students.

3. During Fall and Winter quarters 9 PEP students registered for GC skills classes, more than double the number of students registered for GC skills classes in the control groups. By Spring quarter 1981, the number of students registered for skills classes was equal for PEP and the control groups. While control group students enrolling in non-GC classes increased from Fall to Spring quarters, the numbers were the same for the PEP groups during each of the quarters. Students in all groups registered primarily for GC classes.
4. During 1980-81, 1979 PEP students had a lower CCR (45%) compared to the non-PEP (52%), and the psychology class (61%). The CCR of the two control groups were very similar for the three quarters of 1980-81, while PEP II and III showed a 20% decrease in CCR from Fall to Spring quarter. PEP I showed a slight increase. There were no major or consistent differences between CCR's for GC and non-GC classes.

Part III: Follow-Up Telephone Survey of Achieving and Dropout Students

During July 1981 a telephone follow-up survey was initiated with the most successful 1979, 1980 PEP and 1979 control group students and those from these groups that dropped out of the University. The successful students referred to as achieving were those 1979 PEP and control group students who remained registered all 1979-80, achieved at least marginally during 1979-80, registered all of 1980-81, achieved at least a 2.00 cumulative GPA for 1980-81 (N grades included), and completed at least 50% of their credits during 1980-81. The achieving 1980 PEP students were selected using the same criteria (i.e., registered all three quarters with at least a 2.00 cumulative GPA and completed 50% of their credits). Dropouts of the 1979 students were defined as those that remained registered all 1979-80 and achieved at least marginally during that year, but did not return to the University or did not complete any credits during 1980-81. 1980 PEP dropouts were defined as those who either did not register Spring quarter 1981 or did not complete any credits Spring quarter.

The number of students in each group identified and actually contacted are summarized below:

1979	<u>Achieving</u>	<u>Identified</u>	<u>Contacted</u>	<u>%</u>
	PEP I	1	1	100
	PEP II	7	4	57
	PEP III	6	3	50
	All PEP	14	8	57
	Non-PEP Control	14	10	71
	Psychology Control	13	6	46
	Total	41	24	59

1980	<u>Achieving</u>	<u>Identified</u>	<u>Contacted</u>	<u>%</u>
	PEP I	8	5	63
	PEP II	9	5	56
	PEP III	10	7	70
	All PEP	27	17	63
	Total Achieving	68	41	60

1979	<u>Dropouts</u>	<u>Identified</u>	<u>Contacted</u>		<u>%</u>
			<u>Phone</u>	<u>File*</u>	
	PEP I	7	2	2	57(29)**
	PEP II	8	4	2	75(50)
	PEP III	12	5	1	50(42)
	All PEP	27	11	5	59(41)
	Non-PEP Control	12	2	2	33(17)
	Psychology Control	16	8	-	50 -
	Total	55	21	7	52(38)

1980	<u>Dropouts</u>	<u>Identified</u>	<u>Contacted</u>		<u>%</u>
			<u>Phone</u>	<u>File*</u>	
	PEP I	15	6	-	40 -
	PEP II	9	4	2	67(44)**
	PEP III	15	5	4	60(33)
	All PEP	39	15	6	54(38)
	Total Dropouts	94	36	13	52(38)

* The files of students who could not be reached were examined to identify reasons for dropping out as noted on the withdrawal form or counselor notes. This column records the number of students whose information was gathered through the files.

**Percentages in parenthesis are based only on those students who were interviewed.

Out of the 162 total achieving and dropout students 77 or 48% were interviewed, while file information was gathered on 13 more giving a total of 56% who provided at least some follow-up information. The achieving students were more likely to be reached (60%) compared to the dropouts (38% interviewed and 14% through file information).

Several sources of information were used to identify student phone numbers, and those that had local telephones were called. At least 10 attempts were made to contact students who could not be reached.

The survey was conducted by the first author using a semi-structured interview format. (See Appendix B for the questionnaires.) Students were encouraged to elaborate on the questions asked and often follow-up questions were initiated by the interviewer.

Since 60% of the achieving students and 38% of the dropouts were actually

contacted, firm conclusions drawn from the survey can not be made. Nevertheless, they do give an indication of the strengths and weaknesses of GC as perceived by a group of students who were successful and those who dropped out. Further, the survey gives some indication of the reasons why students drop out.

Since the majority of the survey questionnaire was given in a free response format, the responses were categorized to simplify quantification of the information. The major findings were:

1. The responses of the 25 contacted achieving 1979 and 1980 PEP students were combined. Factors frequently mentioned which most contributed to their academic success were: the PEP Program (76%), teachers and instruction (52%), their own motivation and determination (32%), specific classes in English, speech, and ethnic areas (32%), the Learning Resource Centers (20%), advising and counseling (20%), and the HELP Center (12%).

Those factors most frequently mentioned which least contributed to their academic success were: PEP Program (28%--primarily because it was too easy), not enough flexibility in class selection (16%), and 24% indicated none.

Twenty-three (92%) of the achieving PEP students who were interviewed plan to return to GC Fall, 1981.

When asked how GC or the University could have better served you, 24% desired improved counseling and advising, 16% wished more flexibility in class selection, 12% asked for more information about the University and GC, and 20% could not think of anything.

2. The 10 (71%) non PEP control group students who were contacted indicated most often that the teachers and instruction (90%) most contributed to their academic success. Sixty percent cited specific courses (English, communications, GC 1894), 50% mentioned the Reading and Writing Skills Center, 40% the math tutoring room, and 30% the general atmosphere in GC.

Seventy percent could not think of anything that least contributed to their academic success.

Ninety percent are returning to GC Fall, 1981 (one student is planning on working and entering a vocational training program).

Suggesting ways to be better served by the University and College, these students mentioned shorter registration lines and fewer closed classes (20%). Others mentioned more financial aid information, better orientation to college, and some courses being too easy. Forty percent could not think of anything.

Additionally, 50% of these students received good advising while 70% thought that their advising was weak. Positive experiences with the Reading and Writing Skills Center were noted by 20% of the students and 20% thought the classes were well organized.

3. Out of the 13 students in the psychology class control group who were identified as achieving (students who had transferred from GC were not included), 6 (46%) were contacted. These students indicated most frequently that advising and counseling (83%) most contributed to their academic success. The teachers and teaching assistants were cited by 67%, 67% noted specific classes (especially writing lab), and 50% attributed their success mainly to their own motivation.

Suggestions for improvement included better advising and counseling (50%), fewer course selection restrictions (33%), and more short term certificate programs (33%).

All of the students contacted were planning to return for Fall 1981.

4. At least partial responses of the 1979 and 1980 PEP dropouts were received from 56% of those identified and 39% were actually interviewed. All but one of the students contacted was not enrolled in any other post-secondary educational institution during 1980-81. Forty-eight percent of the students are definitely planning to return to GC for Fall 1981, 37% will probably or definitely not attend, and 15% were not sure. All but one of the students has been working full or part time since leaving school, mainly at semi-skilled jobs.

The major reasons cited for dropping out of college were: personal and family problems (41%), financial problems (30%), and health problems (19%). Others mentioned were: lack of motivation or interest in college (8%), academic problems (8%), and interest in more vocationally oriented training (8%).

Asked how GC or the University could have better served you, 12% said by allowing them to take more courses specific to their field, 46% could not think of any response.

Although all of these students dropped out, all of them said that the time spent in the College was useful to them, primarily because they learned a great deal through their courses and about themselves.

Specific classes (e.g. writing and literature, ethnic classes, and psychology) were cited most often as being most helpful to them (69%), followed by the HELP Center (31%), the PEP Program (15%), the Learning Resource Centers (15%), instructors and teaching assistants (15%), and advising and counseling (12%). Specific classes were indicated as being the least helpful (15%). The lines, red-tape, and bigness of the University were also mentioned most often (15%). Others suggested more financial aid (8%) and better advising and counseling (8%). Thirty-five percent could not think of an answer to what was least helpful.

When asked what would have increased your chances of remaining in school and achieving better, 50% answered nothing, 12% said better advising, and 12% indicated lower costs.

Other comments from these students showed that 31% thought that the advising and counseling was good, while 12% indicated that it needed improvement.

5. The dropouts of the 1979 non PEP and psychology class control groups were combined since the numbers for each group were very small. Three of the 10 students who were contacted attended other educational institutions during 1980-81 (a 4-year college, a 2-year college, and a vocational technical school). Twenty percent plan to return to GC or the University for Fall 1981, and 50% are definitely not planning to attend the University. Sixty percent of these students have been working full or part time since leaving school.

Most common reasons for leaving school were family and personal problems (40%), financial problems (30%), lack of interest and motivation for college (30%), and the bigness and red-tape of the University (20%).

GC or the University could have better served this group through improved advising and counseling (20%) and by providing more financial assistance (20%). Thirty percent answered none to the question.

All but one of the students found the time that they spent here useful (especially by learning a lot about themselves and through classes). The instructors and teaching assistants were cited most often as most helpful (50%) followed by advising and counseling (20%), and specific classes (20%). Least helpful factors during their stay at the University included the bigness of the University and some classes (30%) and poor advising (20%).

When asked how GC or the University could have helped them remain at the University, 60% could not think of anything.

Additional information obtained from these students suggested that they wanted courses more focused on their career goals (20%) and that they were undecided about their career goals (20%).

Summary of the Telephone Survey

While both successful and unsuccessful students were generally positive about GC and the University, there were areas that they thought could be improved. One of these was the counseling and advising received. Some students were very positive, while others had quite negative experiences with their advisors. In the latter category were students who complained of their advisors not being available or not giving correct information and guidance. Students generally were supportive of the PEP Program. Perhaps the biggest complaint about PEP was that some students felt they were inappropriately placed in it only because of their ethnic background and consequently the classes were too easy and too restrictive for them. Several mentioned the positive experience of being with other students of their own ethnic background and of the help that the HELP Center provided.

Generally, for those students who left the University, it was for reasons other than academic. Most students dropped out for personal, financial, and health reasons. A few desired more vocationally oriented, short term training. However, those in the latter group indicated that attending college helped them make that decision.

All but one student who withdrew found the time spent at the University useful and helpful to them. Specifically, they were very pleased with the

teachers and the instruction and the various services (e.g. counselors and tutors).

This survey represented responses from our 50% of the selected group and it provides insight into GC's programming and services. To increase response rate and reduce response bias, the survey should be repeated with another group of similar students during the academic year or immediately at the time of withdrawal. Follow-up surveys especially with dropouts, are difficult because of the transient nature of student populations and the resulting difficulty in locating them. The free responses from the present survey can form the basis of a more structured questionnaire which could be administered easily to students as they leave the institution or at short term follow-up. The structured questionnaire would also lend itself for use by trained interviewers not associated with the University thus reducing response bias.

Discussion and Conclusions

Data collected on 364 freshmen and sophomores over a two-year period provides interesting and important trends. While the impetus for this intensive focus on GC freshmen came as a result of the PEP Program, the study gives useful information about regular GC students in addition to academically underprepared minority students. The issues associated with retaining students and helping them achieve do not only apply to minority students, but to the total GC student population. This is most clearly demonstrated by a difference of only 9% in retention rates between the academically stronger regular GC students and the PEP students after six quarters at the University of Minnesota.

Studies of college student attrition have been occurring for at least 60 years. Surprisingly, attrition rates have remained relatively stable during these years with national research showing approximately 40% of entering freshmen receiving a baccalaureate degree within four years and another 20% receiving a baccalaureate degree sometime in the future (Cope & Hannah, 1975; Summerskill, 1962). Therefore, about 40% of entering freshmen never achieve a bachelor's degree. These figures will vary depending on the type of institution. The less selective colleges, two year colleges, and public institutions tend to have higher attrition rates. Therefore, it would be expected that GC, because it is an open door, two year public institution, would experience higher attrition rates compared to national averages.

The purpose for initiating the PEP Program was to improve the retention and achievement of those minority students who come to GC with exceptionally weak academic skills. Unfortunately there is no simple answer to the question "is PEP working?" But, after two years, we know more about this group of students and how the College may become more effective working with them.

It is clear that for many GC students, a program such as PEP is needed. These students come to the College with poor academic backgrounds and with social/economic difficulties which make college success extremely difficult without the added attention. However, all minority students are not necessarily candidates for the PEP Program, and therefore greater efforts need to be expanded to identify those students who are most in need of PEP. One of the biggest frustrations of PEP students were those who complained of "being put in PEP" simply because of their color. Based on the 1980 PEP students the most successful students were those who graduated from high school, had at least one parent with post high school training, had

post baccalaureate degree aspirations, had selected a college major, and had been out of school longer than three years. If these characteristics can be cross-validated with another group of students, perhaps by using these variables, better identification of students truly in need of special attention can be made. Further, for the 1980 students, high school percentile rank was not a good indicator of future success, and the GC Placement Tests, while an improvement over the former battery, only minimally predicted future success.

Once the students are enrolled and have completed Fall quarter, the data strongly suggests that more accurate predictions can be made for those who will be successful the remainder of the year. Based on Fall quarter CCR and high school graduation status, 59% of the variance for cumulative GPA (with N's) can be predicted ($p < .0001$). Further, 40% of the variance for cumulative CCR can be predicted based on Fall quarter GPA (with N's) and the Reading Test of the GC Placement Battery ($p < .0001$). These data suggest that those students who did not achieve Fall quarter are not likely to be successful the remainder of the year. At the end of Fall quarter those who did not achieve will likely need special attention Winter quarter beyond the PEP program to help them be successful. These findings are encouraging as they help to identify those students within PEP who will need extra attention during the year.

Generally, the 1980 PEP students achieved at similar academic levels compared to the 1979 PEP students. However, 70% of the 1980 students were retained during their freshmen year compared to 59% of the 1979 students. Practically all of this increase can be attributed to the American Indian students who doubled their retention rate from 1979 to 1980. The 70% retention rate for all PEP students during 1980 was equal to the rate of the psychology control group during 1979.

While overall the 1979 PEP students tended to have weaker academic backgrounds compared to other GC freshmen, the 1980 PEP students did not appear as weak with respect to high school percentile rank. The 1980 PEP students, however, scored in the lower third of the GC students on the GC Placement Tests.

At the end of six quarters in GC, 30% of the 1979 PEP students were still enrolled. This compares with 39% and 35% for the academically stronger control groups. The Chicano/Latino students were retained at a 42% rate. Not surprisingly, since the 1979 PEP students needed developmental skill courses, none of them had transferred from GC, while 19% from the control groups had transferred from GC and one student had graduated.

The retention data suggest that greater effort needs to be expanded during the second year to assist PEP students, especially Black students, who although registered, actually completed fewer credits compared to PEP I and II during their second year. It is difficult to determine the "what and how" of the needed assistance since most of the students dropped out of college for personal, financial, and health reasons. Few identified academic reasons or specific complaints with GC or the University for withdrawing. However, some students, by their own admission and by reviewing their class registrations, could have received better advising and counseling. Some students lacked basic information about the

educational/collegiate process and others were unclear about their career goals. It is likely that regular, intensive counseling focusing on educational and career planning needs to be conducted with PEP students throughout their years in the College. Perhaps the counseling should be initiated by their advisor or conducted in small groups as adjunctive to regular course offerings. Withdrawing from college is not necessarily negative if the decision is made through a regular decision-making process. Counseling can help students better decide about their educational/career objectives as they become aware of possible alternatives for themselves. It may also assist with some of the personal/social problems that contribute to dropping out.

Another issue that needs to be resolved is the overly restrictiveness of class selection that some PEP students feel. This may be partly a problem of inaccurate recruitment of PEP students. As greater sophistication is developed in selecting students who truly need PEP, students should feel less bored and restricted by PEP classes. Also, as the year advances and the student's academic progress merits it, there should be less restriction on course selection. While students in the 1980 PEP group completed non-GC courses less often than GC courses, those that did complete them achieved at a higher GPA level compared to GC courses.

For the most part, GC students are generally pleased with their experience in the College. In fact, many had difficulty thinking of negative aspects of their experience and even those who dropped out found the time they spent in college useful to them. Students were most laudatory of their instructors and the access that they had to them. They were also, for the most part, appreciative of the skills and tutoring centers and the counseling services.

To summarize, after two years, it appears that a program such as PEP is needed in GC as there are many students who can benefit from it. As greater sophistication in identifying students for the program is developed, a stronger educational program can be realized. Specifically, some students need intensive attention for their entire freshman year and into their second year. Improved programming, counseling, and advising may not necessarily increase retention, but may help students make better choices about alternatives to college. To those students who came to the University but withdrew, the experience was not necessarily negative as they learned and broadened themselves. The PEP Program was conceived as a way to improve college retention and achievement of minority students. It can not be said that it has been completely successful, or a devastating failure. Data suggests that it has been moderately successful as students in it are achieving at levels only slightly below students who have stronger academic backgrounds. Through increased refinement and experimentation, perhaps greater success can be achieved in helping these students progress at the University or find more appropriate post-secondary alternatives.

References

Brothen, T., Romano, J., Robertson, D., and Garfield, J. Norms For the General College Placement Program. General College Research Reports. University of Minnesota, January, 1981.

Cope, R. G. and Hannah, W. Revolving College Doors: The Causes and Consequences of Dropping Out, Stepping Out, and Transferring. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Romano, J., Brothen, T., Garfield, J., and Robertson, D. A Demographic and Academic Description of General College Students Fall 1980. General College Research Reports. University of Minnesota, April, 1981.

Romano, J. I. and Garfield, J. B. A Curricular Experiment For Underprepared Minority Students: An Evaluation of the General College Pilot Educational Packages (PEP). General College, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, August, 1981.

Summerskill, J. Dropouts From College. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American College. New York: Wiley, 1962.

APPENDIX A

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 - Means and Standard Deviations of Grade Point Averages (GPA) for 1980 PEP Students Who Remained Registered Each Quarter	20
2 - Means and Standard Deviations of the Credit Completion Ratio (CCR) for 1980 PEP Students	24
3 - 1980 PEP Students Percentage of Withdrawals from the University During the 1980-81 Academic Year	26
4 - 1980 PEP Students Registration Status for the Entire 1980-81 Academic Year	28
5 - Credit Distributions for 1980 PEP Students	29
6 - Comparisons Between 1980 PEP Students and 1979 PEP Students and Control Groups on First Year Grade Point Average (GPA), Credit Completion Ratio (CCR), and Registration Status	31
7 - High School Academic Background	33
8 - GC Placement Tests	34
9 - Student Survey Questionnaire	35
10 - Means $\bar{X}$ of Grade Point Average (GPA) and Credit Completion Ratio (CCR), and Percentages of Retention Variables Classified by Selected Personal Variables for 1980 PEP Students (N=39)*	44
11 - Correlations Between High School Data and GC Placement Tests and Measures of Retention and Academic Progress for 1980 PEP Students	45
12 - Summary of 1979-81 Registration Status for 1979 PEP and Control Groups	46
13 - 1979 PEP and Control Group Students Percentage of Withdrawals from the University During the 1980-81 Academic Year	47
14 - Means and Standard Deviations of Grade Point Averages (GPA) for all 1979 PEP and Control Group Students Who Remained Registered for Each Quarter of 1980-81	50
15 - Means and Standard Deviations of Grade Point Averages (GPA) for PEP I, II, and III Students Who Remained Registered for Each Quarter of 1980-81	53
16 - Means and Standard Deviations of the Credit Completion Ratio (CCR) for all 1979 PEP and Control Group Students During 1980-81	56

TABLE 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR
1960 PEP STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED EACH QUARTER
(Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F's not included in calculations*)

	PEP I (N=26)			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.79 (2.50)	2.98 (2.37)	3.17 (3.17)	2.81 (2.34)
Standard Deviation	.88 (1.21)	.79 (1.24)	1.04 (1.04)	.67 (1.14)
Number of Students	17 (19)	20 (22)	3 (3)	20 (22)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.40 (1.20)	2.63 (1.94)	2.33 (1.40)	2.61 (1.69)
Standard Deviation	.55 (1.32)	.70 (1.33)	.58 (1.34)	.63 (1.31)
Number of Students	5 (10)	18 (22)	3 (5)	18 (23)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	3.00 (1.00)	2.41 (1.09)	3.25 (1.86)	2.56 (1.22)
Standard Deviation	0.0 (1.73)	.71 (1.28)	.29 (1.75)	.66 (1.34)
Number of Students	1 (3)	10 (20)	4 (7)	11 (21)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA	2.65 (1.84)	2.74 (1.64)	3.12 (1.83)	2.66 (1.64)
Standard Deviation	.77 (1.39)	.65 (1.20)	.61 (1.62)	.55 (1.18)
Number of Students	17 (22)	21 (25)	7 (11)	21 (25)

*GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

TABLE 1 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR
 1980 PEP STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED EACH QUARTER
 (Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, N's not included in calculations*)

PEP II (N=18)

	<u>GC Skills Classes</u>	<u>GC Regular Classes</u>	<u>Non- GC Classes</u>	<u>All Classes</u>
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.67 (1.00)	2.87 (2.61)	-	2.86 (2.49)
Standard Deviation	.58 (1.41)	.74 (1.11)	-	.71 (1.20)
Number of Students	3 (7)	17 (18)	0	17 (18)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.20 (1.83)	3.28 (2.56)	3.00 (2.25)	3.04 (2.31)
Standard Deviation	.84 (1.17)	.50 (1.45)	.71 (1.40)	.56 (1.37)
Number of Students	5 (6)	11 (14)	5 (6)	13 (16)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.33 (1.75)	2.40 (1.80)	3.15 (2.36)	2.55 (2.09)
Standard Deviation	1.15 (1.50)	.74 (1.27)	.79 (1.70)	.80 (1.26)
Number of Students	3 (4)	6 (8)	3 (4)	9 (11)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA	2.28 (1.27)	2.31 (2.36)	3.13 (2.11)	2.72 (2.13)
Standard Deviation	.76 (1.28)	.67 (1.17)	.51 (1.13)	.56 (1.15)
Number of Students	7 (12)	17 (18)	5 (6)	17 (18)

*GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

TABLE 1 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR
1980 PEP STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED EACH QUARTER
(Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, N's not included in calculations*)

	PEP III (N=35)			
	<u>GC Skills Classes</u>	<u>GC Regular Classes</u>	<u>Non- GC Classes</u>	<u>All Classes</u>
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.45 (1.60)	2.41 (1.58)	-	2.45 (1.60)
Standard Deviation	.56 (1.28)	.86 (1.26)	-	.76 (1.24)
Number of Students	13 (20)	26 (35)	0	26 (35)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	3.00 (1.00)	2.42 (1.81)	2.75 (2.75)	2.41 (1.77)
Standard Deviation	1.41 (1.67)	.67 (1.05)	1.50 (1.50)	.65 (1.05)
Number of Students	2 (6)	23 (28)	4 (4)	23 (28)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.40 (1.49)	2.55 (1.90)	2.00 (.67)	2.52 (1.84)
Standard Deviation	.77 (1.26)	.75 (1.26)	0.0 (1.15)	.65 (1.15)
Number of Students	9 (13)	18 (23)	1 (3)	20 (24)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA	2.52 (1.56)	2.44 (1.54)	2.60 (2.08)	2.44 (1.53)
Standard Deviation	.65 (1.29)	.58 (1.10)	1.34 (1.68)	.54 (1.08)
Number of Students	17 (25)	27 (35)	5 (6)	27 (35)

*GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

TABLE 1 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR
1980 PEP STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED EACH QUARTER
(Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, N's not included in calculations*)

	All PEP (N=79)			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.65 (1.88)	2.71 (2.06)	3.17 (3.17)	2.67 (2.03)
Standard Deviation	.74 (1.37)	.83 (1.29)	1.04 (1.04)	.73 (1.25)
Number of Students	3 (46)	63 (75)	3 (3)	63 (75)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.42 (1.32)	2.70 (2.02)	2.75 (2.10)	2.63 (1.87)
Standard Deviation	.79 (1.36)	.72 (1.26)	.96 (1.42)	.66 (1.23)
Number of Students	12 (22)	52 (64)	12 (15)	54 (67)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.43 (1.47)	2.48 (1.57)	3.06 (1.75)	2.54 (1.66)
Standard Deviation	.81 (1.32)	.72 (1.30)	.63 (1.64)	.67 (1.27)
Number of Students	13 (20)	34 (51)	8 (14)	40 (56)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA	2.53 (1.60)	2.63 (1.76)	2.97 (1.97)	2.58** (1.70)
Standard Deviation	.71 (1.32)	.64 (1.18)	.85 (1.46)	.55 (1.14)
Number of Students	41 (59)	65 (78)	17 (23)	65 (78)

*GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

**1980 PEP GPA (without N's) significantly higher than 1979 non-PEP control group, $P < .01$.

TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE CREDIT COMPLETION RATIO (CCR) FOR 1980 PEP STUDENTS

	PEP I (N=26)				PEP II (N=18)			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR	.71	.47	.60	.53	.72	.88	0.0	.80
Standard Deviation	.46	.35	.55	.36	.42	.29	0.0	.33
Number of Students	24	25	5	25	17	18	1	18
<u>Winter Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR	.33	.49	.23	.38	.63	.66	.64	.63
Standard Deviation	.47	.35	.44	.30	.48	.43	.48	.38
Number of Students	14	23	13	23	7	16	7	16
<u>Spring Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR	.25	.28	.44	.31	.56	.31	.36	.42
Standard Deviation	.50	.34	.53	.35	.53	.43	.48	.43
Number of Students	4	22	9	23	9	14	7	19
<u>Cumulative</u>								
Mean CCR	.52	.38	.29	.38	.63	.60	.38	.58
Standard Deviation	.44	.30	.40	.29	.41	.32	.43	.31
Number of Students	26	26	17	26	17	18	10	18

TABLE 2 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE CREDIT COMPLETION RATIO (CCR) FOR 1980 PEP STUDENTS

	PEP III (N=35)				All PEP (N=79)			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR	.59	.57	0.0	.56	.66	.61	.43	.61
Standard Deviation	.46	.41	0.0	.39	.45	.40	.53	.38
Number of Students	30	35	1	35	71	78	7	78
<u>Winter Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR	.25	.64	1.0	.59	.34	.59	.48	.53
Standard Deviation	.44	.39	0.0	.37	.47	.39	.50	.36
Number of Students	20	29	4	14	41	68	24	68
<u>Spring Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR	.38	.58	.33	.52	.41	.41	.39	.42
Standard Deviation	.43	.43	.52	.37	.46	.42	.49	.38
Number of Students	17	25	3	25	30	61	19	63
<u>Cumulative</u>								
Mean CCR	.45	.52	.64	.50	.51	.49	.39	.48*
Standard Deviation	.40	.38	.48	.35	.42	.35	.43	.33
Number of Students	32	35	7	35	75	79	34	79

*1979 Psychology Class Control Group significantly higher than 1980 PEP CCR, P .01.

TABLE 3

1980 PEP STUDENTS PERCENTAGE OF WITHDRAWALS FROM THE UNIVERSITY DURING THE 1980-81 ACADEMIC YEAR

	PEP I (N=26)						PEP II (N=18)					
	<u>Fall</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Winter</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Spring</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Fall</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Winter</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Spring</u> <u>Quarter</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>
Not registered or fees not paid	0	0	2	8	3	12	0	0	2	11	3	17
Withdrew during first 2 weeks	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Withdrew after second weekk	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	17
Remained registered	23	88	23	88	23	86	18	100	16	89	12	66
Remained registered and earned at least 1 passing grade	20	77	17	65	11	42	17	94	13	72	9	50

TABLE 3 (cont.)

1980 PEP STUDENTS PERCENTAGE OF WITHDRAWALS FROM THE UNIVERSITY DURING THE 1980-81 ACADEMIC YEAR

	<u>PEP III (N=35)</u>						<u>ALL PEP (N=79)</u>					
	<u>Fall Quarter</u>		<u>Winter Quarter</u>		<u>Spring Quarter</u>		<u>Fall Quarter</u>		<u>Winter Quarter</u>		<u>Spring Quarter</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>
Not registered or fees not paid	0	0	5	15	9	26	0	0	9	12	15	19
Withdrew during first 2 weeks	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Withdrew after second week	0	0	1	3	1	3	2	2	1	1	4	5
Remained registered	35	100	28	82	24	71	76	96	67	86	59	76
Remained registered and earned at least 1 passing grade	27	77	23	68	20	59	64	81	53	68	40	51

TABLE 4

1980 PEP STUDENTS REGISTRATION STATUS FOR THE ENTIRE 1980-81 ACADEMIC YEAR

	<u>PEP I</u>		<u>PEP II</u>		<u>PEP III</u>		<u>ALL PEP</u>	
	(N=26)		(N=18)		(N=35)		(N=79)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>
Completed registration all three quarters	22	85	14	78	24	68	60	76
Remained registered all three quarters	20	77	12	67	23	66	55	70
Remained registered and earned at least one passing grade each quarter	11	42	9	50	20	57	40	51

TABLE 5
CREDIT DISTRIBUTIONS FOR 1980 PEP STUDENTS

	<u>PEP I (N=26)</u>				<u>PEP II (N=18)</u>			
	<u>GC Skills Classes</u>	<u>GC Regular Classes</u>	<u>Non- GC Classes</u>	<u>All Classes</u>	<u>GC Skills Classes</u>	<u>GC Regular Classes</u>	<u>Non- GC Classes</u>	<u>All Classes</u>
<u>Fall Quarter</u>								
Number of Students	24	25	5	25	17	18	1	18
Total Credits	91	231	10	332	64	177	4	245
Average Credits	3.8	9.2	2.0	13.3	3.8	9.8	4.0	13.6
<u>Winter Quarter</u>								
Number of Students	14	23	13	23	7	16	7	16
Total Credits	79	228	41	348	38	172	39	249
Average Credits	5.6	9.9	3.2	15.1	5.4	10.8	5.57	15.6
<u>Spring Quarter</u>								
Number of Students	4	22	9	23	9	14	7	19
Total Credits	13	268	33	340	35	146	36	187
Average Credits	3.2	12.2	3.7	14.8	3.9	10.4	5.14	9.8
<u>Cumulative</u>								
Number of Students	26	26	17	26	17	18	10	18
Total Credits	183	727	84	996	137	495	79	711
Average Credits	7.0	28.0	4.9	38.3	8.06	27.5	7.9	39.5

TABLE 5 (cont.)
CREDIT DISTRIBUTIONS FOR 1980 PEP STUDENTS

	<u>PEP III (N=35)</u>				<u>PEP IV (N=79)</u>			
	<u>GC Skills Classes</u>	<u>GC Regular Classes</u>	<u>Non- GC Classes</u>	<u>All Classes</u>	<u>GC Skills Classes</u>	<u>GC Regular Classes</u>	<u>Non- GC Classes</u>	<u>All Classes</u>
<u>Fall Quarter</u>								
Number of Students	30	35	1	35	71	78	7	78
Total Credits	130	346	1	477	285	754	15	1054
Average Credits	4.3	9.9	1.0	13.6	4.0	9.7	2.1	13.5
<u>Winter Quarter</u>								
Number of Students	20	29	4	14	41	68	24	68
Total Credits	52	373	13	438	169	773	93	1035
Average Credits	2.6	12.9	3.2	31.8	4.1	11.4	3.9	15.22
<u>Spring Quarter</u>								
Number of Credits	17	25	3	25	30	61	19	63
Total Credits	98	248	14	360	146	662	83	891
Average Credits	5.8	9.9	4.7	14.4	4.87	10.8	4.4	14.1
<u>Cumulative</u>								
Number of Credits	32	35	7	35	75	79	34	79
Total Credits	280	967	28	1275	600	2189	191	2980
Average Credits	8.75	27.6	4.0	36.4	8.0	27.7	5.6	37.7

TABLE 6

COMPARISONS BETWEEN 1980 PEP STUDENTS AND 1979 PEP STUDENTS AND CONTROL GROUPS
ON FIRST YEAR GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA), CREDIT COMPLETION RATIO (CCR), AND REGISTRATION STATUS

	PEP I 1979-80 (N=36)	PEP I 1980-81 (N=26)	PEP II 1979-80 (N=42)	PEP II 1980-81 (N=18)	PEP III 1979-80 (N=38)	PEP III 1980-81 (N=35)	ALL PEP 1979-80 (N=116)	ALL PEP 1980-81 (N=79)	NON-PEP CONTROL 1979-80 (N=86)	PSYCHOLOGY CLASS CONTROL 1979-80 (N=83)
GPA*										
Fall	2.66	2.81	2.81	2.86	2.64	2.45	2.73	2.67	2.27	2.45
Winter	2.52	2.61	2.82	3.04	2.74	2.41	2.73	2.63	2.26	2.44
Spring	2.31	2.56	2.82	2.55	2.53	2.52	2.62	2.54	2.33	2.48
Cumulative	2.56	2.66	2.72	2.72	2.58	2.44	2.64	2.58	2.24	2.43
GPA**										
Fall	1.46	2.34	2.57	2.49	1.95	1.60	2.05	2.03	1.60	2.15
Winter	1.52	1.69	2.10	2.31	2.17	1.77	1.97	1.87	1.77	2.20
Spring	1.14	1.22	1.87	2.09	1.51	1.84	1.58	1.66	1.43	2.03
Cumulative	1.21	1.64	2.21	2.13	1.71	1.53	1.75	1.70	1.47	2.01
CCR										
Fall	.48	.53	.84	.80	.72	.56	.70	.61	.61	.84
Winter	.35	.38	.59	.63	.54	.59	.51	.53	.62	.80
Spring	.33	.31	.48	.42	.38	.52	.41	.42	.49	.66
Cumulative	.35	.38	.64	.58	.51	.50	.51	.48	.53	.73

*N's not included in GPA

**N's included in GPA

TABLE 6 (cont.)

COMPARISONS BETWEEN 1980 PEP STUDENTS AND 1979 PEP STUDENTS AND CONTROL GROUPS
ON FIRST YEAR GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA), CREDIT COMPLETION RATIO (CCR), AND REGISTRATION STATUS

	PEP I	PEP I	PEP II	PEP II	PEP III	PEP III	ALL PEP	ALL PEP	NON-PEP	PSYCHOLOGY CLASS
	1979-80	1980-81	1979-80	1980-81	1979-80	1980-81	1979-80	1980-81	CONTROL	CONTROL
	(N=36)	(N=26)	(N=42)	(N=18)	(N=38)	(N=35)	(N=116)	(N=79)	(N=86)	(N=83)
Completed Registration all three quarters	42%	85%	76%	78%	71%	68%	64%	76%	70%	72%
Remained Registered										
Fall	86%	88%	98%	100%	92%	100%	92%	96%	90%	95%
Winter	69%	88%	88%	89%	76%	82%	78%	86%	76%	78%
Spring	44%	88%	67%	67%	71%	71%	61%	76%	72%	71%
All 3 Qtrs.	42%	80%	67%	67%	66%	66%	59%	70%	64%	70%

* N's not included in GPA

** N's included in GPA

TABLE 7

HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

Graduated from High School

	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>
Yes	16	62	13	72	21	60	50	64
No	4	15	4	22	10	28	18	23
Missing	6	23	1	6	4	11	11	14

Means and Standard Deviations of High School Percentile Ranks

	<u>PEP I' (N=26)</u>	<u>PEP II (N=18)</u>	<u>PEP III (N=35)</u>	<u>ALL PEP (N=79)</u>
Mean Percentile	28.6	33.3	40.1	35.3
Standard Deviation	21.83	21.05	23.48	22.39
Number of Students	10.0	10.0	18.0	38.0

TABLE 8

GC PLACEMENT TESTS

Means ($\bar{X}$), Standard Deviations (SD), and Percentile Ranks (PR)*

	<u>PEP I (N=26)</u>				<u>PEP II (N=18)</u>				<u>PEP III (N=35)</u>				<u>ALL PEP (N=75)</u>			
	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	PR	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	PR	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	PR	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	PR
Reading	24	22.3	8.26	45	17	19.8	5.79	35	33	15.6	8.75	21	74	18.7	8.44	31
Writing	24	23.6	5.03	38	17	20.0	5.38	22	33	18.6	6.68	17	74	20.6	6.22	24
Whole Numbers	24	4.8	2.32	22	17	5.2	3.94	30	33	4.5	2.32	17	74	4.8	2.97	21
Arithmetic	24	14.0	5.63	37	17	12.5	5.81	29	33	10.6	4.87	18	74	12.2	5.48	25
Algebra	24	6.8	4.64	27	17	5.0	4.24	16	33	4.3	3.93	12	74	5.3	4.32	18

* Percentile ranks are based on norms developed from more than 1300 GC students
(Brothen, Romano, Robertson, & Garfield, 1981).

TABLE 9

STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

	PEP I (N=18)		PEP II (N=10)		PEP III (N=11)		All PEP (N=39)*	
A. <u>Sex</u>								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female	14	78	3	30	5	46	22	56
Male	4	22	7	70	6	54	17	44
B. <u>Age (years)</u>								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13-22	11	61	5	50	7	64	23	59
23-25	4	22	3	30	3	27	10	26
26-30	0	0	2	20	0	0	2	5
31-55	3	17	0	0	0	0	3	8
36 and over	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	2
Mean	22.6		22.6		24.3		23.1	
Standard Deviation	5.88		3.86		10.55		6.99	
C. <u>Financial Aid</u>								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	17	94	8	80	10	91	35	90
No	1	6	1	10	1	9	3	8
Missing data	0	0	1	10	0	0	1	2
D. <u>Transfer Plans</u>								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	4	22	1	10	2	18	7	18
Yes, to another College at U of M	7	39	5	50	7	64	19	49
Yes, to another College outside U of M	1	6	1	10	0	0	2	5
Not Sure	6	33	3	30	2	18	11	28

*N= Number of PEP students who completed the GC Student Survey.

TABLE 2 (cont.)

STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

	PEP I (N=13)		PEP II (N=10)		PEP III (N=11)		All PEP (N=39)	
E. <u>Work Plans</u>								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	4	22	3	30	2	18	9	23
Yes, 1-10 hrs/wk.	1	6	0	0	1	9	2	5
Yes, 11-20 hrs/wk.	4	22	1	10	2	18	7	18
Yes, 21-25 hrs/wk.	1	6	4	40	2	18	7	18
Yes, 36 or more hrs/wk.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not sure	3	44	1	10	4	36	13	33
Missing data	0	0	1	10	0	0	1	2
F. <u>Highest Grade Completed Before Enrollment</u>								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
8th grade or less	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	3
Some High School	1	6	0	0	1	9	2	5
High School graduate	9	50	7	70	7	64	23	59
G.E.D.	5	28	2	20	1	12	8	20
1 yr. college or less	2	11	1	10	2	18	5	13
G. <u>Years Since Last Attended Any School</u>								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 1 yr.	9	50	3	30	4	36	16	41
1-2 yrs.	2	11	2	20	3	27	7	18
3-5 yrs.	3	17	2	20	1	9	6	15
6-10 yrs.	2	11	3	30	2	18	7	18
More than 10 yrs.	2	11	0	0	1	9	3	8
H. <u>Degree Goals</u>								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	2
Certificate	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	2
Associates	3	17	2	20	0	0	5	13
Bachelors	4	22	2	20	3	27	9	23
Masters	5	28	6	60	7	64	18	46
Doctorate	3	17	0	0	1	9	4	10
Missing data	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	2

TABLE 9 (cont.)

STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

I. How Well Prepared

	PLP I							
	Very Well		Fairly Well		Not Well		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Math	1	6	7	39	10	56	0	0
Writing	4	22	12	67	2	11	0	0
Reading	5	28	10	56	3	17	0	0
Study skills	1	6	11	60	5	28	1	6
Musical and artistic	1	6	9	50	8	44	0	0
Library and research	0	0	11	61	7	39	0	0
Time management	1	6	9	50	8	44	0	0
Science	2	11	3	17	8	44	0	0
History, social sciences	1	6	11	60	5	28	1	6
Art, music, literature appreciation	4	22	11	61	3	17	0	0
Decision-making	3	17	11	61	4	22	0	0
Career and education plans	4	22	6	33	8	44	0	0

TABLE 9 (cont.)

STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

I. How Well Prepared

	Very Well		Fairly Well		Not Well		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Math	1	10	7	10	1	10	1	10
Writing	2	20	4	40	3	30	1	10
Reading	3	30	5	50	1	10	1	10
Study skills	1	10	5	50	2	20	2	20
Musical and artistic	1	10	3	30	5	50	1	10
Library and research	1	10	5	50	3	30	1	10
Time management	0	0	6	60	3	30	1	10
Science	1	10	5	50	3	30	1	10
History, social sciences	1	10	4	40	4	40	1	10
Art, music, literature appreciation	1	10	3	30	4	40	2	20
Decision-making	2	20	5	50	1	10	2	20
Career and education plans	0	0	4	40	4	40	2	20

TABLE 9 (cont.)

STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

I. How Well Prepared

TABLE III

	Very Well		Fairly Well		Not Well		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Math	2	18	3	27	6	54	0	0
Writing	3	27	7	64	1	9	0	0
Reading	2	18	9	82	0	0	0	0
Study skills	2	18	5	46	4	36	0	0
Musical and artistic	0	0	7	64	4	36	0	0
Library and research	0	0	7	64	4	36	0	0
Time management	0	0	7	64	4	36	0	0
Science	1	9	5	46	5	46	0	0
History, social sciences	1	9	8	73	2	18	0	0
Art, music, literature appreciation	0	0	7	64	3	27	1	9
Decision-making	2	18	8	73	1	9	0	0
Career and education plans	1	9	5	46	5	46	0	0

TABLE 9 (cont.)
STUDENT SURVEY, QUESTIONNAIRE

I. For Well Prepared

	All FFP							
	Very Well		Fairly Well		Not Well		Missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Math	4	10	17	44	17	44	1	2
Writing	9	23	23	59	6	15	1	2
Reading	10	26	24	62	4	10	1	2
Study skills	4	10	21	54	11	28	3	8
Musical and artistic	2	5	19	49	17	44	1	2
Library and research	1	2	23	59	14	37	1	2
Time management	1	2	22	57	15	39	1	2
Science	4	10	18	46	16	42	1	2
History, social sciences	3	8	23	59	11	28	2	5
Art, music literature appreciation	5	13	21	54	10	26	3	8
Decision-making	7	18	24	62	6	15	2	5
Career and education plans	5	13	15	39	17	44	2	5

TABLE 9 (cont.)
STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

	PEP I		PEP II		PEP III		All PEP	
<u>J. Counseling Needs*</u>	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Financial	12	67	6	60	9	82	27	60
Family	3	17	1	10	0	0	4	10
Study skills	11	61	5	50	9	82	25	64
Career and education plans	9	50	7	70	7	64	23	59
Making friends	4	22	0	0	1	9	5	13
Marriage or couples	1	6	0	0	1	9	2	4
General stress reduction	2	11	2	22	2	18	6	15
Chemical dependency	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	2
Test or speech anxiety	2	11	2	20	7	64	11	28
Other	2	11	0	0	1	9	3	8

*More than one could be indicated.

K. College Major Plans

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Undecided	11	61	3	30	1	9	15	38
Business	0	0	2	20	2	18	4	10
Humanities	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	2
Social science	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	2
Math or science	1	6	0	0	3	27	4	10
Medical science	1	6	1	10	1	9	3	8
Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	4	22	3	30	2	18	9	23
Missing	0	0	1	10	1	9	2	5

TABLE 9 (cont.)

STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

L. Parents' Educational Background

	PEP I				PEP II			
	Mother		Father		Mother		Father	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
3th grade or less	4	22	6	33	2	20	3	30
Some high school	3	17	5	28	3	30	1	10
High school graduate	3	17	3	17	4	40	2	20
Some college	2	11	1	6	0	0	1	10
Post high school vocational training	2	11	2	11	0	0	1	10
Bachelors degree	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters degree	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	0
Doctorate degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missing data	1	6	1	6	1	10	1	10

TABLE 9 (cont.)

STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

L. Parents' Educational Background

	PEP III				All PEP			
	Mother		Father		Mother		Father	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
8th grade or less	2	18	2	18	8	20	11	28
Some high-school	1	9	0	0	7	18	6	15
High school graduate	4	36	4	36	11	28	9	23
Some college	1	9	1	9	3	8	3	8
Post high school vocational training	1	9	0	0	3	8	3	8
Bachelors Degree	1	9	0	0	3	8	0	0
Masters degree	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2
Doctorate degree	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	2
Missing data	1	9	3	27	3	8	5	13

TABLE 10

MEANS ($\bar{X}$) OF GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA) AND CREDIT COMPLETION RATIO (CCR),
AND PERCENTAGES OF RETENTION VARIABLES CLASSIFIED BY SELECTED PERSONAL VARIABLES
FOR 1980 PEP STUDENTS (N=39)*

	<u>CCR</u>		<u>GPA</u> (without H's)		<u>GPA</u> (with H's)		<u>Reg. All</u> <u>3 Qtrs</u>		<u>Earned At</u> <u>Least 1 Pass</u> <u>Grade All</u> <u>3 Qtrs</u>	
	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	N	%	N	%
<u>Sex</u>										
Female	22	.51	18	2.82	21	1.93	17	77	13	59
Male	17	.59	15	2.57	17	1.95	12	71	10	59
<u>Age</u>										
17-22 years	23	.55	20	2.59	23	1.80	19	83	15	65
23 and older	16	.53	13	2.83	15	2.15	10	62	8	50
<u>Parent's Academic Background</u>										
High School grad or less	23	.52	19	2.60	22	1.82	16	70	12	52
Training beyond High School	13	.63	12	2.86	13	2.29	11	85	10	77
<u>Student's Aspirations</u>										
Four yr. degree or less	16	.53	13	2.66	16	1.84	11	69	9	56
Beyond four yr. degree	22	.55	19	2.74	21	1.99	17	77	13	59
<u>Student's Major</u>										
Undecided	15	.48	11	2.84	15	1.90	10	67	9	60
Major indicated	22	.60	21	2.66	21	2.00	18	82	13	59
<u>Years Since Last in High School</u>										
Less than 3 yrs.	23	.51	20	2.55	23	1.71	17	74	13	56
3 yrs. or more	16	.60	13	2.94	15	2.23	12	75	10	62

*Number of IFP students who completed GC Student Survey

**Mother or father whoever is highest

TABLE 11

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOL DATA AND GC PLACEMENT TESTS AND
MEASURES OF RETENTION AND ACADEMIC PROGRESS
FOR 1980 PEP STUDENTS

	Registered all three quarters	Earned at least 1 passing grade all 3 quarters	Cumulative CCR	Cumulative GPA (no N's)	Cumulative GPA (N's)
<u>High School</u> <u>File Rank</u> (N=38)	-.06	-.07	.06	.02	.09
<u>High School Grad</u> <u>GC Placement</u> <u>Tests</u> (N=74)	.24*	.32**	.32**	.23*	.39**
Reading	.27*	-.09	-.09	.40**	.10
Writing	.10	-.09	-.04	.34**	.07
Whole Numbers	.08	.00	.13	.11	.20*
Arithmetic	.16	-.03	.17	.16	.27*
Algebra	.20	-.04	.00	.01	-.02
Fall CCR	.58**	.61**	-	-	-
Fall GPA (no N's)	.21*	.20	-	-	-
Fall GPA (with N's)	.56**	.51**	-	-	-

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF 1979-1981 REGISTRATION STATUS FOR 1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUPS

	<u>PEP I</u>		<u>PEP II</u>		<u>PEP III</u>		<u>ALL PEP</u>		<u>NON PEP CONTROL</u>		<u>PSYCHOLOGY CLASS CONTROL</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fall 1979	36	100	42	100	38	100	116	100	86	100	83	100
Remained Registered all 1979-80	15	42	28	67	25	66	68	59	55	64	58	70
Did not return to U of M 1980-81	26	72	18	43	14	37	58	50	35	41	24	29
Returned to U of M for at least part of 1980-81	10	28	24	57	24	63	58	50	51	59	59	71
Completed Registration all three quarters 1980-81	6	17	16	38	18	47	40	34	33*	38	27**	33***
Remained Registered all three quarters 1980-81	5	14	14	33	16	42	35	30	31*	36	25**	30***
Remained Registered & earned at least 1 pass grade each quarter 1980-81	5	14	12	29	7	18	24	21	23*	27	20**	24***
Total number of students who remained registered all 6 quarters (F79-S81)	5	14	14	33	16	42	35	30	25*	29	21**	26***

* Does not include 5 students (6%) who transferred from GC during 1980-81.

** Does not include 11 students (13%) who transferred from GC during 1980-81 and the 1 (1%) AA graduate.

*** Percentage calculated with total N=82 since one person received AA degree Fall 1980.

TABLE 13

1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS PERCENTAGE OF WITHDRAWALS
FROM THE UNIVERSITY DURING THE 1980-81 ACADEMIC YEAR

	PEP I (N=36)*						PEP II (N=42)*					
	<u>Fall</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Winter</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Spring</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Fall</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Winter</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Spring</u> <u>Quarter</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>
Not registered or fees not paid	26	72	28	78	30	83	19	48	21	50	25	60
Withdrew during first 2 weeks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Withdrew after first 2 weeks	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	2	2	5	1	2
Remained registered	10	28	7	12	6	17	22	50	18	45	16	38
Transferred to another U of M College	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-

*Refers to the number of students who began in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 13 (cont.)

1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS PERCENTAGE OF WITHDRAWALS
FROM THE UNIVERSITY DURING THE 1980-81 ACADEMIC YEAR

	PEP III (N=36)*						All PEP (N=116)*					
	<u>Fall</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Winter</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Spring</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Fall</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Winter</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Spring</u> <u>Quarter</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Not registered or fees not paid	17	45	17	45	19	50	62	53	66	57	74	64
Withdrew during first 2 weeks	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Withdrew after first 2 weeks	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	1	3	3	3	3
Remained registered	21	55	20	53	17	45	53	46	45	40	39	34
Transferred to another U of M College	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-

*Refers to the number of students who began in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 13 (cont.)

1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS PERCENTAGE OF WITHDRAWALS
FROM THE UNIVERSITY DURING THE 1980-81 ACADEMIC YEAR

	Non-PEP Control (N=86)*						Psychology Class Control (N=83)*					
	<u>Fall</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Winter</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Spring</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Fall</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Winter</u> <u>Quarter</u>		<u>Spring</u> <u>Quarter</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Z</u>
Not registered or fees not paid	38	44	42	49	47	55	29	36	36	43	39	47
Withdrew during first 2 weeks	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
Withdrew after first 2 weeks	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	1	1
Remained registered	42	49	38	45	31	36	43	52	32**	38	30	36
Transferred to another U of M College	5	6	-	-	-	-	11	13	-	-	-	-

*Refers to the number of students who began in Fall, 1979.

**One student not included received the AA degree Fall, 1980.

TABLE 14

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR ALL 1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED FOR EACH QUARTER OF 1980-81
(Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, N's not included in calculations**)

	PEP (N=116)***			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA *	2.67 (1.45)	2.29 (1.56)	2.64 (2.19)	2.33 (1.69)
Standard Deviation	1.00 (1.51)	.76 (1.17)	.92 (1.35)	.76 (1.18)
Number of Students	9 (15)	35 (49)	11 (13)	42 (53)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA *	3.17 (1.49)	2.62 (1.86)	2.76 (2.03)	2.64 (1.75)
Standard Deviation	.94 (1.74)	.75 (1.35)	.91 (2.19)	.76 (1.31)
Number of Students	9 (19)	31 (42)	11 (15)	34 (45)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA *	3.33 (.71)	2.46 (1.53)	2.42 (1.56)	2.36 (1.36)
Standard Deviation	.58 (1.44)	.92 (1.27)	.96 (1.40)	.85 (1.12)
Number of Students	3 (14)	26 (36)	11 (16)	29 (39)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA *	2.85 (1.25)	2.44 (1.49)	2.68 (2.01)	2.42 (1.50)
Standard Deviation	.95 (1.48)	.63 (1.13)	.86 (1.31)	.63 (1.11)
Number of Students	16 (31)	41 (54)	23 (27)	45 (57)

*Does not include students who transferred from GC.

**GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

***Refers to the number of students who began the Program in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 14 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR ALL 1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED FOR EACH QUARTER OF 1980-81 (Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, N's not included in calculations^{**})

	Non-PEP Control (N=86) ^{***}			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA [*]	2.00 (.86)	2.18 (1.62)	2.43 (1.89)	2.19 (1.62)
Standard Deviation	1.00 (1.22)	.67 (1.10)	.98 (1.36)	.63 (1.07)
Number of Students	3 (7)	32 (41)	7 (9)	32 (41)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA [*]	2.06 (.92)	2.32 (1.68)	2.65 (1.51)	2.24 (1.48)
Standard Deviation	1.36 (1.37)	.71 (1.08)	1.10 (1.44)	.65 (1.04)
Number of Students	4 (9)	27 (33)	9 (13)	29 (36)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA [*]	2.00 (1.00)	2.13 (1.67)	2.18 (1.92)	2.05 (1.57)
Standard Deviation	1.00 (1.26)	.51 (.93)	.75 (1.00)	.59 (.93)
Number of Students	3 (6)	24 (29)	11 (12)	26 (31)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA [*]	2.01 (.86)	2.19 (1.53)	2.45 (1.76)	2.14 (1.46)
Standard Deviation	.90 (1.17)	.56 (.91)	.92 (1.19)	.50 (.88)
Number of Students	6 (14)	39 (44)	19 (23)	39 (44)

*Does not include students who transferred from GC.

**GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

***Refers to the number of students who began the Program in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 14 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR ALL 1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED FOR EACH QUARTER OF 1980-81 (Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, N's not included in calculations**)

	Psychology Class Control (N=83)***			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA*	3.50 (2.00)	2.54 (2.02)	2.36 (1.42)	2.51 (1.90)
Standard Deviation	.58 (1.91)	.79 (1.22)	.94 (1.39)	.71 (1.15)
Number of Students	4 (7)	34 (41)	12 (20)	35 (43)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA*	2.25 (1.80)	2.64 (2.30)	2.13 (1.30)	2.51 (1.94)
Standard Deviation	1.26 (1.43)	.75 (1.12)	.78 (1.13)	.62 (1.03)
Number of Students	4 (5)	28 (31)	13 (19)	28 (32)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA*	3.20 (2.40)	2.24 (1.93)	2.37 (1.75)	2.33 (1.96)
Standard Deviation	.35 (1.62)	.77 (1.04)	.87 (1.25)	.79 (1.10)
Number of Students	3 (4)	26 (29)	17 (22)	27 (30)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA*	2.96 (2.22)	2.51 (2.03)	2.20 (1.31)	2.46 (1.80)
Standard Deviation	1.01 (1.59)	.70 (1.05)	.69 (1.09)	.64 (.99)
Number of Students	9 (12)	39 (44)	24 (33)	39 (45)

*Does not include students who transferred from GC.

**GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

***Refers to the number of students who began the Program in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 15

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR 1979
PEP I, II, AND III STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED FOR EACH QUARTER 1980-81
(Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, N's not included in calculations*)

	PEP I (N=36)**			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	3.00 (1.25)	2.36 (1.09)	2.00 (1.00)	2.46 (1.17)
Standard Deviation	0.0 (1.56)	.67 (1.29)	0.0 (1.41)	.64 (1.25)
Number of Students	2 (3)	5 (10)	1 (2)	6 (10)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	3.50 (1.75)	2.69 (1.69)	3.00 (3.00)	2.93 (2.01)
Standard Deviation	.71 (2.06)	.62 (1.49)	1.00 (1.00)	.86 (1.62)
Number of Students	2 (4)	4 (6)	3 (3)	5 (7)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	4.00 (1.33)	2.69 (1.99)	3.00 (3.00)	2.57 (1.58)
Standard Deviation	0.0 (2.31)	1.34 (1.65)	0.0 (0.0)	1.22 (1.41)
Number of Students	1 (3)	5 (6)	1 (1)	5 (6)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA	3.50 (1.63)	2.41 (1.23)	2.67 (2.00)	2.65 (1.31)
Standard Deviation	.58 (1.65)	.58 (1.25)	.58 (1.41)	.52 (1.31)
Number of Students	4 (6)	6 (10)	3 (4)	6 (10)

*GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

**Refers to the number of students who began PEP in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 15 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR 1979
PEP I, II, AND III STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED FOR EACH QUARTER OF 1980-81
(Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, N's not included in calculations*)

	PEP II (N=42)**			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	2.57 (2.00)	2.40 (1.85)	2.50 (2.36)	2.40 (2.06)
Standard Deviation	1.13 (1.50)	.86 (1.25)	1.29 (1.52)	.94 (1.22)
Number of Students	7 (9)	15 (19)	4 (4)	20 (22)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	3.08 (2.29)	2.63 (2.47)	2.70 (2.70)	2.61 (2.37)
Standard Deviation	1.11 (1.73)	.85 (1.01)	.87 (.87)	.83 (.90)
Number of Students	6 (8)	17 (17)	4 (4)	18 (18)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	3.00 (1.00)	2.50 (1.85)	2.80 (1.86)	2.49 (1.61)
Standard Deviation	0.0 (1.55)	.88 (1.13)	1.10 (1.68)	.80 (1.07)
Number of Students	2 (6)	14 (16)	5 (7)	14 (16)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA	2.59 (1.86)	2.52 (1.94)	2.73 (2.42)	2.49 (1.97)
Standard Deviation	1.00 (1.45)	.71 (1.15)	1.00 (1.28)	.74 (1.08)
Number of Students	11 (14)	19 (22)	11 (11)	22 (24)

*GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

**Refers to the number of students who began PEP in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 15 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPA) FOR 1979
 PEP I, II, AND III STUDENTS WHO REMAINED REGISTERED FOR EACH QUARTER OF 1980-81
 (Scale: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1; N's not included in calculations*);

	PEP III (N=38)**			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	- (0.0)	2.15 (1.51)	2.83 (2.43)	2.19 (1.54)
Standard Deviation	- (0.0)	.70 (.99)	.75 (1.27)	.55 (1.01)
Number of Students	0 (3)	15 (20)	6 (7)	16 (21)
<u>Winter Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	3.00 (.43)	2.58 (1.36)	2.65 (1.33)	2.55 (1.10)
Standard Deviation	0.0 (1.13)	.66 (1.40)	1.12 (1.60)	.63 (1.26)
Number of Students	1 (7)	10 (19)	4 (8)	11 (20)
<u>Spring Quarter</u>				
Mean GPA	- (0.0)	2.21 (.98)	1.92 (1.12)	2.06 (1.05)
Standard Deviation	- (0.0)	.70 (1.11)	.73 (1.09)	.72 (1.05)
Number of Students	0 (5)	7 (14)	5 (8)	10 (17)
<u>Cumulative</u>				
Mean GPA	3.00 (.27)	2.35 (1.15)	2.64 (1.65)	2.26 (1.08)
Standard Deviation	0.0 (.90)	.57 (.93)	.82 (1.32)	.48 (.90)
Number of Students	1 (11)	16 (22)	9 (12)	17 (23)

*GPA calculated when N=0 in parentheses.

**Refers to the number of students who began PEP in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 16

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE CREDIT COMPLETION RATIO (CCR)
FOR ALL 1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS DURING 1980-81

	PEP I (N=36) ^{**}				PEP II (N=42) ^{**}			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR [*]	.42	.41	.33	.44	.63	.65	.46	.67
Standard Deviation	.52	.41	.58	.40	.50	.42	.45	.34
Number of Students	3	10	3	10	11	20	6	23
<u>Winter Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR [*]	.50	.38	.50	.40	.64	.69	.57	.69
Standard Deviation	.58	.45	.55	.43	.48	.34	.49	.31
Number of Students	4	8	6	8	9	19	6	20
<u>Spring Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR [*]	.33	.57	.50	.48	.22	.56	.48	.45
Standard Deviation	.53	.39	.71	.32	.44	.38	.48	.33
Number of Students	3	6	2	6	9	17	9	17
<u>Cumulative</u>								
Mean CCR [*]	.46	.43	.43	.41	.52	.56	.61	.55
Standard Deviation	.46	.40	.53	.38	.43	.36	.41	.28
Number of Students	6	10	7	10	16	24	13	24

*Does not include students who transferred from GC.

**Refers to the number of students who began in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 16 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE CREDIT COMPLETION RATIO (CCR)
FOR ALL 1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS DURING 1980-81

	PEP III (N=36)**				All PEP (N=116)**			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR*	0.0	.57	.48	.53	.41	.57	.45	.57
Standard Deviation	0.0	.45	.48	.40	.50	.43	.46	.38
Number of Students	6	21	11	21	20	51	20	54
<u>Winter Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR*	.12	.36	.29	.33	.42	.50	.44	.49
Standard Deviation	.35	.41	.38	.39	.50	.42	.46	.40
Number of Students	8	20	8	20	21	47	20	48
<u>Spring Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR*	0.0	.30	.40	.32	.17	.45	.45	.40
Standard Deviation	0.0	.31	.37	.36	.38	.40	.43	.34
Number of Students	6	17	8	19	18	40	19	42
<u>Cumulative</u>								
Mean CCR*	.07	.38	.36	.36	.33	.46	.47	.45
Standard Deviation	.27	.36	.37	.33	.43	.37	.42	.32
Number of Students	14	22	15	23	36	56	35	57

*Does not include students who transferred from GC.

**Refers to the number of students who began in Fall, 1979.

TABLE 16 (cont.)

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE CREDIT COMPLETION RATIO (CCR)
FOR 1979 PEP AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS DURING 1980-81

	Non-PEP Control (N=86)**				Psychology Class Control (N=83)**			
	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes	GC Skills Classes	GC Regular Classes	Non- GC Classes	All Classes
<u>Fall Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR*	.34	.63	.58	.59	.50	.71	.46	.66
Standard Deviation	.45	.43	.51	.42	.53	.41	.51	.38
Number of Students	14	43	12	43	8	43	26	43
<u>Winter Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR*	.28	.65	.44	.57	.50	.77	.47	.66
Standard Deviation	.43	.38	.47	.34	.53	.40	.45	.36
Number of Students	13	36	17	38	8	34	23	34
<u>Spring Quarter</u>								
Mean CCR*	.40	.61	.64	.58	.75	.71	.62	.68
Standard Deviation	.52	.44	.48	.40	.50	.38	.46	.34
Number of Students	10	33	16	33	4	31	25	31
<u>Cumulative</u>								
Mean CCR*	.32	.57	.56	.52	.55	.69	.46	.61
Standard Deviation	.44	.34	.41	.32	.49	.33	.40	.30
Number of Students	23	45	27	45	14	45	37	45

*Does not include students who transferred from GC.

**Refers to the number of students who began in Fall, 1979.

APPENDIX B

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 - First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for 1979 PEP and Control Groups and 1980 PEP Students (N's not included)	60
2 - First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for 1979 PEP and Control Groups and 1980 PEP Students (N's included)	60
3 - First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for PEP I (1979 vs. 1980)	61
4 - First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for PEP II (1979 vs. 1980)	61
5 - First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for PEP III (1979 vs. 1980)	62
6 - First Year Credit Completion Ratio (CCR) for 1979 PEP and Control Groups and 1980 PEP Students	62
7 - Credit Completion Ratio (CCR) and Percentage Remaining Registered for PEP I, II, and III for 1979 and 1980	63
8 - Percentage of Students Remaining Registered for 1979 PEP and Control Groups and 1980 PEP Students	64
9 - Grade Point Average (GPA) with and without N's for 1979 PEP and Control Groups During 1980-81	64
10 - Credit Completion Ratio (CCR) for 1979 PEP and Control Groups During 1980-81	65
11 - Percentage of Students Remaining Registered for 1979 PEP and Control Groups During 1980-81	65

Figure 1: First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for 1979 PEP and Control Groups and 1980 PEP Students (N's not included)




Figure 2: First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for 1979 PEP and Control Groups and 1980 PEP Students (N's included)




Figure 3: First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for
PEP I (1979 vs. 1980)




Figure 4: First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for
PEP II (1979 vs. 1980)




Figure 5: First Year Grade Point Average (GPA) for
PEP III (1979 vs. 1980)





Figure 6: First Year Credit Completion Ratio (CCR) for
1979 PEP and Control Groups and 1980 PEP Students








Figure 7: Credit Completion Ratio (CCR) and Percentage Remaining Registered for PEP-I, II, and III for 1979 and 1980

— 1980 Students
 1979 Students

Figure 8: Percentage of Students Remaining Registered for 1979 PEP and Control Groups and 1980 PEP Students.




Figure 9: Grade Point Average (GPA) with and without N's for 1979 PEP and Control Groups during 1980-81.




Figure 10: Credit Completion Ratio (CCR) for 1979 PEP and Control Groups During 1980-81.




Figure 11: Percentage of Students Remaining Registered for 1979 PEP and Control Groups During 1980-81.



APPENDIX C

<u>Follow-up Questionnaires</u>	<u>Page</u>
1979 Dropout Students	67
1980 Dropout Students	69
1980 Achieving Students	71
1979	72

1979 Dropout Students

To be administered to PEP, non-PEP Control, and Psych students who entered the PEP Program or GC Fall 79, remained for the entire 79-80 year and achieved at least marginally, but either did not return to GC or the University for 1980-81 or did not complete any credits during 1980-81.

Telephone Follow-up Survey
Summer 1981
General College PEP Program
1979-1981

- (1) Name: _____ Phone: _____
- (2) Category (check one): PEP (79-80) AmInd _____
PEP (79-80) Chicano _____
PEP (79-80) Black _____
non-PEP Control (79-80) _____
Psych Class (79-80) _____
- (3) Were you a student at the U of M at any time during the 1980-81 year?
(a) Yes, Day School College _____
Quarters F W S SS
(circle one)
(b) Yes, Extension Quarters F W S SS
(circle one)
(c) No
- (4) Were you a student during the 1980-81 year in any post-secondary educational institution other than the U of M?
(a) Yes, Name of Institution _____ Location _____
Dates in Attendance _____
Do you plan on continuing at that institution during 1981-82?
Yes _____ No _____
(b) No
- (5) Do you plan to return to the General College or the U of M during the next year (1981-82)?
(a) Yes, definitely (b) Probably not (c) Definitely not
(d) Cannot answer
- (6) Since you left the University, what have you been doing? Be specific.
(For example: if working, state at what and where.)

(continued)

- (7) What factors caused you not to return to the General College or U of M (or not achieve any credits) during the 1980-81 year? Be specific. (Include academic, personal, and social factors.)
- (8) In what ways could the General College or U of M have better served you? Be specific.
- (9) Even though you did not return to the University or achieve well during 1980-81, in what ways was the time you spent here useful or not useful to you?
- (10) What General College or University programs, services, or courses were most helpful to you during your time here? Be specific.
- (11) What General College or University programs, services, or courses were least helpful to you during your time here? Be specific.
- (12) How could the General College or U of M have helped to increase the chance of you returning to school or achieving better during the 1980-81 year? Be specific.
- (13) Additional Comments.

1980 Dropout Students

To be administered to PEP students who entered the PEP Program Fall 80 who either did not register Spring 81 or did not complete any credits Spring 81 (received all I, N, W grades).

Telephone Follow-up Survey
Summer 1981
General College PEP Program
1979-1981

- (1) Name: _____ Phone: _____
- (2) Category (check one): PEP (80-81) AmInd _____
PEP (80-81) Chicano _____
PEP (80-81) Black _____
- (3) During the 1980-81 year during what Quarters were you a student at the University of Minnesota?
(a) Fall (b) Winter (c) Spring
- (4) During the 1980-81 year were you a student at any post-secondary educational institution other than the University of Minnesota?
(a) Yes, Name of Institution _____ Location _____
Dates in Attendance _____
Do you plan on continuing at that Institution during 1981-82?
Yes _____ No _____
- (b) No
- (5) Do you plan to return to the General College or the University of Minnesota during the next year (1981-82)?
(a) Yes, definitely (b) Probably not (c) Definitely not
(d) Cannot answer
- (6) Since you left the University, what have you been doing? Be specific.
(For Example: if working, state at what and where).
- (7) What factors caused you to leave (or receive no credits Spring 81) from the General College or University of Minnesota during the 1980-81 year? Be specific. (Include academic, personal, and social factors.)
- (8) In what ways could the General College or University of Minnesota have better served you? Be specific.

(continued)

- (9) Even though you withdrew or did not receive any credits Spring 81 from the University, in what ways was the time you spent here useful or not useful to you? Be specific.
- (10) What General College or University programs, services, or courses were most helpful to you during your time here? Be specific.
- (11) What General College or University programs, services, or courses were least helpful to you during your time here? Be specific.
- (12) How could the General College or University of Minnesota have helped to increase the chance of you remaining in school or achieving better during 1980-81? Be specific.
- (13) Additional comments.

1980 Achieving Students

To be administered to PEP students who entered the PEP Program Fall 80 and who made adequate progress during the 1980-81 year.

Telephone Follow-up Survey
Summer 1981
General College PEP Program
1979-1981

- (1) Name: _____ Phone: _____
- (2) Category (check one): PEP (80-81) AmInd _____
PEP (80-81) Chicano _____
PEP (80-81) Black _____
- (3) During the 1980-81 year during what Quarters were you a student at the University of Minnesota?
(a) Fall (b) Winter (c) Spring
- (4) What factors most contributed to your academic success during 1980-81?
(Include GC or U of M programs, services, or courses in addition to other factors of a more personal or social nature.)
- (5) What factors least contributed to your academic success during 1980-81?
(Include GC or U of M programs, services, or courses in addition to other factors of a more personal or social nature.)
- (6) Do you plan to return to the General College or the University of Minnesota during the next year (1981-82)?
(a) Yes, definitely (b) Probably not (c) Definitely not
(d) Cannot answer
If not, why? _____
- (7) In what ways could GC or U of M have better served you? Be specific.
- (8) Additional comments.

1979 Achieving Students

To be administered to PEP, non-PEP control, and Psych students who entered the PEP Program or GC Fall 1979, remained registered all 1979-80, achieved at least marginally well during 1979-80, registered all 1980-81 and achieved well (at least 2.0 gpa including N's but not W & I) and .5cc (all completed/all attempted) for entire 1980-81.

Telephone Follow-up Survey
Summer 1981
General College PEP Program
1979-1981

- (1) Name: _____ Phone: _____
- (2) Category (check one): PEP (79-80) AmInd _____
PEP (79-80) Chicano _____
PEP (79-80) Black _____
Non-PEP Control (79-80) _____
Psych Class (79-80) _____
- (3) During the 1980-81 year during what Quarters were you a student at the U of M?
(a) Fall (b) Winter (c) Spring
- (4) What factors most contributed to your academic success during 1979-81?
(Include GC or U of M programs, services, or courses in addition to other factors of a more personal or social nature.)
- (5) What factors least contributed to your academic success during 1979-81?
(Include GC or U of M programs, services, or courses in addition to other factors of a more personal or social nature.)
- (6) Do you plan to return to the General College or the U of M next year (1981-82)?
(a) Yes, definitely (b) Probably not (c) Definitely not
(d) Cannot answer (e) b, c, or d why? _____
- (7) In what ways could GC or the U of M have better served you? Be specific.
- (8) Additional comments.

Teaching Writing in the PEP III Package

April Knutson
Lecturer
Division of Arts, Communication
and Philosophy
General College

As writing instructor in the PEP III (Black) program, I have participated in the planning and development of the package concept for retention of minority students in General College. My work with students of varying writing ability has been guided and supported by Candido Zanoni, coordinator of the PEP program; Carol White, Sue Hancock, Bill Smith, and Jerry Freeman--counselors at the HELP Center; Vera Rorie and her staff of the Black Learning Resource Center and other members of the teaching staff at General College, including especially Lou Bellamy and Tiffany Patterson, instructors in the Division of Arts, Communication and Philosophy, and Nathan Smith, instructor in the Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Teaching in the PEP program involves not only preparing for class, teaching, and correcting papers; by its very definition, the package concept of education requires meetings between instructors, counselors, and administrators to coordinate the curriculum, to discuss the needs of the group as a whole, and the problems of individual students, and to define our educational philosophy. Many questions have been raised during the course of these meetings of the teaching team and our groping toward answers has helped shape my methods of teaching. I have also learned much about the situation of Black students and educators at the University of Minnesota--and their frustrations and expectations.

Racism affects Blacks at all stages in their education. As children, they have faced 'tracking' in the elementary schools, culturally-biased national examinations in high schools, and a curriculum that denies their heritage. Black students who enter General College are determined to obtain a higher education despite their earlier negative experiences in schools. They may have poor high school records and low scores on college-entrance examinations, but this does not mean that they are

incapable of learning. Many have the potential and motivation to become exceptional scholars and productive professionals. But they have faced many obstacles.

Many of the students for whom the PEP III program was designed are older students who have been in the military service and/or dead-end jobs. Others are single parents receiving AFDC. They are seeking a college degree in order to better their lives. Their goals are to get off welfare and find a challenging job. They want to be educated and make their families proud of them. One former PEP III student has a "wall of respect" at home where she displays her exams and papers for her children to admire.

The first year of college is difficult for any student, but for these students who have been away from "books" for years, who have families to support and homes to take care of, the pressures of the academic routine were overwhelming. Before General College set up the PEP retention packages, all too many minority students were not surviving their first year at the University. The package concept contained several elements to help these students make it through their freshman year:

- 1) Support seminars conducted by the counselors at the HELP Center. These weekly sessions dealt with study skills, academic programs, and career planning;
- 2) Tutorial assistance for specific courses through the Learning Resource Centers;
- 3) Regular meeting of the teaching and counseling staff of each package to coordinate syllabi and evaluate the students' progress; and
- 4) writing courses each quarter.

Writing skills were considered a key factor for the retention of minority students. At the University of Minnesota, every graduate must

pass two quarters of freshman composition. Furthermore, most upper-division university courses require term papers. Students are often faced with take-home mid-quarter exams and final exams requiring essay answers.

The writing instructors in the PEP programs are expected to teach students basic writing skills and the material covered in two quarters of freshman composition. Because students enter the program with varying writing skills and experience, the syllabus for each quarter has to be tailored to meet the students' individual needs. In the first year of the PEP program, some students entering the package had already taken one quarter of freshman composition. Others were judged ready for the first quarter of freshman composition. Based on their performance on tests taken during freshman orientation, others were urged to take a basic writing skills course before attempting freshman composition. Thus, three different writing courses were taught in one classroom: GC 1411, Fundamentals of Usage; GC 1421, Writing Lab--Personal Writing; and GC 1422, Writing Lab--Communicating in Society. In addition, the writing instructors were to coordinate their writing assignments with the syllabi of the other courses in the package, so that students would be writing about the readings assigned and topics discussed in their other classes.

Writing Across the Curriculum

This last requirement of the writing courses in the PEP program--coordinating the assignments with the other courses in the package--actually made the job easier rather than more difficult. Assignments did not have to be invented; subjects for themes were not pulled out of thin air. Rather, the topics were ones in which the students were deeply involved, through assigned readings and classroom discussions. They knew

that they needed to learn to express themselves clearly and concisely on these topics.

In the first two quarters of PEP III, the students were enrolled in social science courses taught by Nathan Smith: GC 1815, Afro-American Experience, fall quarter; GC 1212, Urban Problems, winter quarter. The year before, in the spring of 1979, Nathan Smith and I had already taught a paired course: 1422 (second quarter freshman composition) and 1212 (Urban Problems). We felt that this pairing had worked well. The students in the writing lab were more responsive to the writing assignments and felt they had learned more than in a "regular" section of freshman composition. In 1212, they did better on the mid-term essay exam and on the term paper than students who were taking the paired writing lab.

This positive experience in pairing a writing course with a "content" course helped shape the package concept of the PEP program. Students would learn writing skills by addressing topics discussed in the rest of their academic program.

The transfer of the 1212-1422 joint registration experiment to the PEP package was not as easy as we had first thought. The students in the original pairing had all been ready for a second-quarter freshman composition course. They were prepared to write expository essays in which they developed ideas, analyzed arguments, and contrasted points of view on controversial topics. They were also prepared to write a research paper, one of the requirements of the Urban Problems course.

By contrast, the students in the PEP III package, with the exception of the three in 1422, were not ready to write expository essays, let alone a research paper. It became apparent that a gap existed between the schedule for work in the basic writing course and the first-quarter writing lab, on the one hand, and requirements of the social science

courses, on the other hand. This gap was, of course, what PEP was all about. Students with little or no writing skills had been enrolled in courses which required essay exams and research papers--and they had failed. The goal of PEP is to help the students succeed by teaching them the skills they need. Coordination of the syllabi of the various courses by the staff of the package is essential to ensure that the students are indeed learning what they need to know when they need it.

In the second year of PEP III, the teaching team decided that the curriculum placed too much emphasis on social science courses, courses for which minority students tend to register anyway. The courses that these students need--and often fail to register for--are science and math. We felt that if the students could begin work in these difficult subjects while in a sheltered package, they would be more likely to complete distribution requirements and more careers would be open to them.

In the winter quarter of 1981, the PEP III writing courses were paired with GC 1131, Principles of Biology. This was certainly a challenge to me, as I had not studied biology since high school. The teaching team met with Douglas Dearden, professor in the Division of Science Business and Mathematics, and he was very excited about the PEP students writing papers on topics from his biology course. He suggested two units from the text for a focus for the writing course. These units, plant reproduction and ecology, were units which students had trouble understanding and which would certainly lend themselves to essay assignments. The teaching team developed classification, comparison-contrast, and process analysis theme assignments for the unit on plant reproduction, and personal experience, definition, and argument theme assignments for the unit on ecology. The students also wrote more general theme assignments that quarter, similar to ones usually taught in freshman composition courses.

The One-Room Schoolhouse

The first quarter of the PEP III writing course was both the most exciting and the most frustrating course I have ever taught. In one room were collected thirty-three students: three of whom were enrolled in 1422; eleven, in 1421; and nineteen in 1411.* They were united by the fact that they were all enrolled in the same package of other courses and they were all Black.

I kept a journal in which I noted the planned daily activity for each class on one page, and recorded what actually occurred in the classroom on the facing page. These two sections of the journal were labelled "Vision" and "Reality," and there was often no correlation between the two.

The students bombarded me with questions the first day: Why were some in 1411, others in 1421, and a few in 1422? Couldn't the ones in basic writing progress through the sequence more rapidly? (Three long quarters at the ever-increasing tuition rates.) What was this package all about anyway? Why were they all Black? Why were they all taking the same courses?

I tried to answer their questions, to reassure them. I explained the history of pairing writing courses with "content" courses, and the growing national trend of "Writing across the curriculum" programs. I also explained that they had been placed in different writing courses because of varying academic preparation and because of varying levels of writing skills. But, I continued, the final determination of their enrollment in the writing segment of the package would be determined by their performance on an impromptu composition and on a pre-test for the usage text in 1411. I had envisioned working with them on reading skills-- and moving from reading to writing--, using an article on reading tips by Bill Cosby, and a short selection (2 pages) from the Autobiography *formerly numbered 1405

of Malcolm X. But they wanted to start writing immediately. I passed out the first theme assignment (a narration of a recent incident), explained it briefly, and they began to write.

This eagerness to write, to get their lives and ideas down on paper, was characteristic of the first group of PEP III students throughout the quarter. They wanted to write during every class session and to share these writings with each other. A writing teacher's dream! But the careful plans to teach one group grammar, another group narrative and descriptive writing, and the third expository writing were hard to carry out. They all wanted to do personal writing and free writing. And when mid-term time rolled around, they all wanted to work on the essay questions for their social science course.

Fortunately, as in any one-room schoolhouse, the students were learning from each other. They helped each other to correct mechanical errors in their themes and to revise passages to achieve concreteness and clarity. By the second quarter of the PEP package, we had decided to abandon the programmed grammar text. The students wanted to write, and they were learning usage and structure by revisions of their writing. The quantity of writing was more than in a regular writing lab: a theme and a revised theme every week; "free writings" almost every class session; and journals for the social science class. And the quality of their writing was improving. The students were learning sentence structure, paragraph development, and organizational strategies. Those that needed help with particular problems of usage--such as verb forms and subject-verb agreement--were writing out extra exercises from various handbooks. All the students were also doing timed readings and taking quizzes to improve their reading speed and comprehension. The reading element was essential to help all of them cope with the heavy reading load in their other classes.

This high level of classroom activity has been possible to maintain only with the dedicated participation of undergraduate teaching assistants.* They have selected readings and prepared quizzes, presented and discussed sentence-combining exercises, and assisted students in revising rough drafts of their themes. Most important, they have served as role models for the students, proving by their very presence that it is possible for Black students to succeed at the University, pass the tests, write term papers, and be accepted in degree programs.

By the third quarter of the PEP III package, only those students ready for 1422, the second quarter of freshman composition remain in the classroom. A few finish the writing sequence fall quarter; many more finish winter quarter. In the relatively small and homogeneous class of spring quarter, the students concentrate on expository writing with the assignments based on the short stories and novels they are reading for the Afro-American literature course (GC 1816). Lou Bellamy and I have developed a series of assignments that teach the students various strategies of expository writing as they analyze the characters, setting, and plots of the literature.

Conclusions and Questions

One of the questions the first group of PEP III students asked on that first day of the writing class has not yet been answered: Why are we all Black? Some counselors and teachers believe that the characteristic of the PEP packages that is most crucial to the retention of minority students is that each group--Native American Indian, Chicano and Black--has a program of its own. Black students gain strength and confidence

* In 1979-80, the undergraduate teaching assistant for the PEP III writing courses was Harold White, a former General College student who is majoring in Agricultural Engineering at the Institute of Technology, in 1980-81, the assistant was Ronald Judy, a senior in the University Without Walls, studying comparative philosophy. Currently, the assistant is Lois Miller, a senior in the College of Education.

in PEP III and give each other the support necessary to survive the first year of college. Furthermore, it is argued, Black students need to learn about their history and literature, a culture which they have not learned in secondary schools. Other counselors and teachers have questioned the concept and practice of the racial exclusiveness of these packages. Why not offer three different curricular programs (with support seminars, writing courses, and teaching teams in each program) and offer these programs to all minority students? The student would then choose the program by the courses offered rather than by the color of her skin.

Some of the former PEP III students have told me that during their first quarter at the University of Minnesota, they really needed the sheltered package which the PEP III program offered, but towards the end of that quarter, they were beginning to feel isolated. Feeling confident about their academic abilities, they were eager to strike out on their own, to forge their own paths through the maze of courses, programs, and colleges at the University. Others were happy to stay in the PEP package for the whole year. One of the advantages which the PEP program offers students is a guarantee that they will be enrolled in the writing labs, that--if they pass these writing courses--they will complete the freshman composition requirement. It is not unusual for mainstream students, in both the College of Liberal Arts and General College, to be locked out of freshman composition sections during their first year of college. Some seniors are still trying to complete the freshman composition requirement! There are never enough sections of writing courses, and the current financial crisis will only exacerbate this situation.

Have the PEP III writing courses been successful? Not all the students have completed the work required in the writing labs. The obstacles faced by Black students do not disappear when they enroll in

PEP III. They still have children to care for and finances to worry about, and some do leave the courses to take care of personal problems. But they are much more likely to return and complete their work than students not enrolled in packages. They can and do write at home now, and they come back one, two or even three quarters later, proudly offering me themes to evaluate. From my perspective as a teacher of writing and literature, this is the greatest success of the PEP III program: students feel confident about relating their experiences and expressing their ideas in written form, and they enjoy writing!

APPENDIX A

PEP PACKAGES
Course Listings
1980-81

PEP I (American-Indian) SCHEDULE: 1980-81

Course Listing

Fall, 1980

- | | | |
|------|--------|---|
| 1405 | (3 cr) | Communication Skills: Fundamentals of Usage and Style |
| or | | |
| 1421 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing |
| or | | |
| 1422 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society |
| 1810 | (3*cr) | Contemporary American Indian Issues |
| 1833 | (4 cr) | Topics in American Indian Studies |

Winter, 1981

- | | | |
|------|--------|--|
| 1405 | (3 cr) | Communication Skills (continued) |
| or | | |
| 1421 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing (continued) |
| or | | |
| 1422 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society |
| 1812 | (3 cr) | American Indian Literature |
| 1832 | (3 cr) | Contemporary Issues in American Indian Education |

Spring, 1981

- | | | |
|------|--------|--|
| 1405 | (3 cr) | Communication Skills (continued) |
| or | | |
| 1421 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing (continued) |
| or | | |
| 1422 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society (continued) |
| 1813 | (3 cr) | Introduction to Inequality |
| 1831 | (3 cr) | American Indian Chemical Dependency Programs: Minnesota |
| 1131 | (5 cr) | Biological Science: Principles (elective) |

PEP II (Chicano/Latino) SCHEDULE: 1980-81

Course Listing

Fall, 1980

- | | | |
|------|--------|---|
| 1275 | (3 cr) | The Chicano Experience |
| 1405 | (3 cr) | Communication Skills: Fundamentals of Usage and Style |
| or | | |
| 1421 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing |
| 1465 | (3 cr) | Oral Communication: Interpersonal Communication |
| 1702 | (2 cr) | Support Seminar |

Winter, 1981

- | | | |
|------|--------|---|
| 1385 | (3 cr) | Chicano Literature |
| 1405 | (3 cr) | Communication Skills: Fundamentals of Usage and Style |
| or | | |
| 1421 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing |
| or | | |
| 1422 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society |
| 1464 | (4 cr) | Oral Communication: Group Process and Discussion |
| 1703 | (2 cr) | Support Seminar II |

Spring, 1981

- | | | |
|------|--------|--|
| 1277 | (3 cr) | Contemporary Chicano Issues |
| 1421 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing |
| or | | |
| 1422 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society |
| 1704 | (2 cr) | Support Seminar III |

ELECTIVES

PEP III (Black) SCHEDULE: 1980-81

Course Listing

Fall, 1980

- | | | |
|------|--------|---|
| 1405 | (3 cr) | Communication Skills: Fundamentals of Usage and Style |
| or | | |
| 1421 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing |
| or | | |
| 1422 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society |
| 1465 | (3 cr) | Oral Communication: Interpersonal Communication |
| 1702 | (2 cr) | Support Seminar I |
| 1815 | (5 cr) | Afro-American Studies |

Winter, 1981

- | | | |
|------|--------|---|
| 1405 | (3 cr) | Communication Skills: Fundamentals of Usage and Style |
| or | | |
| 1421 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing |
| or | | |
| 1422 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society |
| 1461 | (5 cr) | Oral Communications: Basic Principles |
| 1703 | (2 cr) | Support Seminar II |
| 1131 | (5 cr) | Biological Science: Principles (elective) |

Spring, 1981

- | | | |
|------|--------|---|
| 1405 | (3 cr) | Communication Skills: Fundamentals of Usage and Style |
| or | | |
| 1421 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing |
| or | | |
| 1422 | (4 cr) | Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society |
| 1816 | (5 cr) | Blacks in Contemporary Society |
| 1704 | (2 cr) | Support Seminar III |
| 1434 | (5 cr) | Mathematics Skills Review (elective) |

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS

1980-81

Prepared

by

Candido P. Zanoni
PEP Program Coordinator

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS

1980-81

	<u>Fall'80</u>	<u>Winter'81</u>	<u>Spring'81</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
PEP I	\$ 5,678	\$ 6,432	\$ 5,707	\$ 17,817
PEP II	5,244	5,152	5,666	16,062
PEP III	5,324	6,432	7,372	19,128
Evaluation (Razzaque)	1,000	500	500	2,000
HELP Center (Patterson)	1,424	1,424	-----	2,848
CSD (Rivas)	1,424	1,424	-----	2,848
Final Evaluation (Romano)	-----	-----	-----	-----
(Garfield)	-----	-----	2,768	2,768
			1,589	1,589
Miscellaneous (Honoraria etc.)	350	400	380	1,130
TOTALS	\$20,444	\$21,764	\$23,982	\$66,190

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS -- Fall, 1980
(Through December 15, 1980)

PEP I	\$ 5,678
PEP II	5,244
PEP III	5,324
Evaluation	1,000
HELP Center	1,424
CSD	1,424

TOTAL	\$20,094
-------	----------

PEP FUNDING -- Fall, 1980

PEP I (American Indian)

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Instructor(s)</u>	<u>Assistant(s)</u>	<u>Projected Costs</u>	<u>Actual Costs</u>
1405-4	3	28	Shaw, Mary Ellen (TA-I-R)			
1421-15	4	4			\$ 1,424.00	\$ 1,424.00
1422-7	4	1				
				Jennifer Doyle (UTA-WS)	151.94	30.39
1813	3	31	Wiger, Flo (TA-II)		1,819.00	1,819.00
				Sharl Lynn Broome (UTA)	-----	171.20
1833	3	30	Lozier-Lundy (TA-II-40%)		1,819.00	1,819.00
				Ramona Rose Smith (UTA)	-----	81.32
				Miscellaneous UTA's	-----	333.00

				TOTAL		\$ 5,677.91

TA-I-R = Teaching Associate I Replacement
 TA-II = Teaching Associate II
 UTA = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant
 WS = Work Study

PEP FUNDING -- Fall, 1980

PEP II (Chicano/Latino)

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Instructor(s)</u>	<u>Assistant(s)</u>	<u>Projected Costs</u>	<u>Actual Costs</u>
1275	3	21	Carrizales (TA-II-40%)		\$ 1,819.00	\$ 1,819.00
				Gerald Trujillo (UTA-WS)	286.75	57.35
1405-3	3	5	Lund-Chirinos		1,424.00	1,424.00
1421-14	4	11	(TA-I-R)			
1465-3	3	14	Voroba		1,424.00	1,424.00
			(TA-I-R)			
1702-1	2	15	Perez/Rivas		-----	-----
				Rudy Hernandez (UTA-WS)	391.62	78.32
				Raul Paredes (UTA-WS)	536.28	107.26
				Miscellaneous UTA's		334.00
					-----	-----
				TOTAL		\$ 5,243.93

TA-I-R = Teaching Associate I Replacement

TA-II = Teaching Associate II

UTA-WS = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant - Work Study

PEP FUNDING -- Fall, 1980

PEP III (Black)

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Instructor(s)</u>	<u>Assistant(s)</u>	<u>Projected Costs</u>	<u>Actual Costs</u>
1405-5	3	20	Knutson (TA-I-R)			
1421-16	4	12			\$ 1,424.00	\$ 1,424.00
1422-8	4	1				
				Ronald Judy (UTA)	428.00	428.00
1465-6	3	34	Bellamy (TA-II)		1,516.00	1,516.00
1702-2	2	32	T. Patterson (HELP Center)		-----	-----
				Delania Suddeth (UTA-WS)	536.28	107.26
1815	5	47	N. Smith (TA-II-R)		1,516.00	1,516.00
				Miscellaneous UTA's		333.00
					-----	-----
				TOTAL		\$5,324.00

TA-I-R = Teaching Associate I Replacement
 TA-II = Teaching Associate II
 UTA = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant
 WS = Work Study

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS -- Winter, 1981
(Through March 16, 1981)

PEP I	\$6,432
PEP II	5,152
PEP III	6,432
Evaluation	500
HELP Center	1,424
CSD	1,424
TOTAL	\$21,364

PEP EXPENSES -- Winter, 1981
(Through March 15, 1981)

PEP I (American Indian)

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Instructor(s)</u>	<u>Assistant(s)</u>	<u>Projected Costs</u>	<u>Actual Costs</u>
1405-3	3	--				
or			Shaw, M.E.			
1421-14	4	27	(TA-I-R)		\$ 1,424.00	\$ 1,424.00
or						
1422-9	4	--				
				Jennifer Doyle (UTA-WS)	392.04	78.41
1812	3	47	Wiger, Flo (TA-II-40%)		1,819.00	1,819.00
				Donna Thompson (UTA)	-----	111.28
1832	3		Lozier-Lundy (TA-II-40%)		1,819.00	1,819.00
				Archambault (UTA)	-----	-----
				Miscellaneous UTA's		333.00
					-----	-----
				TOTAL		\$ 5,584.69

TA-I-R = Teaching Associate I Replacement
TA-II = Teaching Associate II
UTA = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant
WS = Work Study

PEP EXPENSES -- Winter, 1981

(Through March 15, 1981)

PEP II (Chicano/Latino)

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Instructor(s)</u>	<u>Assistant(s)</u>	<u>Projected Costs</u>	<u>Actual Costs</u>
1385	4	15	Carrizales (TA-II-40%)		\$ 1,819.00	\$ 1,819.00
				Gerald Trujillo (UTA-WS)	205.44	41.09
1405-4 or 1421-15	3 4	2 8	Lund-Chirinos (TA-I-R)		1,424.00	1,424.00
or 1422-10	4	14				
1464-4	4	11	Voroba, S. (TA-I-R)		1,424.00	1,424.00
(See 1385)			Perez/Rivas		-----	-----
				Rudy Hernandez (UTA-WS)	151.94	30.39
				Raul Paredes (UTA-WS)	400.18	80.04
				Miscellaneous UTA's		333.00
					-----	-----
				TOTAL		\$ 5,151.52

PEP EXPENSES -- Winter, 1981
(Through March 15, 1981)

PEP III (Black)

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Instructor(s)</u>	<u>Assistant(s)</u>	<u>Projected Costs</u>	<u>Actual Costs</u>
1405-5	3	--				
or						
1421-16	4	16	Knutson, A. (TA-I-R)		\$ 1,424.00	\$ 1,424.00
or						
1422-11	4	11				
				Ronald Judy (UTA)	428.00	428.00
1461-4	5		Bellamy, L. (TA-II)		1,516.00	1,516.00
1703-2	2		Patterson, T.		1,424.00	1,424.00
				Delania Suddeth (UTA-WS)	618.46	123.69
1131-1 (Elective)	5		Dearden (TA-II-R)		1,516.00	1,516.00
				Miscellaneous UTA's		333.00
					TOTAL	\$ 6,431.69

TA-I-R = Teaching Associate I Replacement
TA-II = Teaching Associate II
UTA = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant
WS = Work Study

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS -- SPRING, 1981
(Through June 15, 1981)

PEP I	\$ 5,707
PEP II	5,666
PEP III	7,372
Evaluation	500
TOTAL	\$19,245

PEP EXPENSES -- Spring, 1981
(Through June 15, 1981)

PEP I (American Indian)

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Instructor(s)</u>	<u>Assistant(s)</u>	<u>Projected Costs</u>	<u>Actual Costs</u>
1405-2	3	2				
or						
1421-13	4	3	Shaw, M.E.		\$ 1,424.00	\$ 1,424.00
or			(TA-I-R)			
1422-10	4	16				
				Jennifer Doyle (UTA-WS)	-----	34.00
1813	3	28	Wiger, Flo (TA-II-40%)		1,819.00	1,819.00
				Donna Thompson (UTA)	-----	278.00
1831	3	19	Lozier-Lundy (TA-II-40%)		1,819.00	1,819.00
				Archambault (UTA)	-----	0
1131-1	5		Biology		-----	-----
			Miscellaneous UTA'S			333.00
					-----	-----
					TOTAL	\$ 5,707.00

TA-I-R = Teaching Associate I Replacement
TA-II = Teaching Associate II
UTA = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant
WS = Work Study

PEP EXPENSES -- Spring, 1981
(Through June 15, 1981)

PEP II (Chicano/Latino)

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Instructor(s)</u>	<u>Assistant(s)</u>	<u>Projected Costs</u>	<u>Actual Costs</u>
1277	3		Carrizales (TA-II-40%)		\$ 1,819.00	\$ 1,819.00
				Gerald Trujillo (UTA-WS)	-----	59.00
1421-12 or 1422-9	4 4	10 14	Lund-Chirinos (TA-I)		1,424.00	1,424.00
				Kim White (UTA)	-----	387.00
1704-2	2	5	Perez/Rivas		1,424.00	1,424.00
				Rudy, Hernandez (UTA-WS)	-----	0
				Raul Paredes (UTA-WS)	-----	116.00
				Antonio Nava (UTA-WS)	-----	104.00
(Electives)						
				Miscellaneous UTA's		333.00
					-----	-----
TOTAL						\$ 5,666.00

TA-I = Teaching Associate I
UTA = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant
WS = Work Study

PEP EXPENSES -- Spring, 1981
(Through June 15, 1981)

PEP III (Black)

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Instructor(s)</u>	<u>Assistant(s)</u>	<u>Projected Costs</u>	<u>Actual Costs</u>
1405-3	3	1				
or						
1421-14	4	-	Knutson, A. (TA-I)		\$ 1,424.00	\$ 1,424.00
or						
1422-11	4	16				
				Ronald Judy (UTA)	428.00	428.00
1816	4	52	Bellamy (TA-II)		1,516.00	1,516.00
				Leon Purnell		643.00
1704-3	2	9	Patterson, T.		1,424.00	1,424.00
				Delania Suddeth (UTA-WS)	-----	180.00
1434-4	5		(Math) (TA-I)		1,424.00	1,424.00
				Miscellaneous UTA's		333.00
				TOTAL		\$ 7,372.00

TA-I = Teaching Associate I
TA-II = Teaching Associate II
UTA = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant
WS = Work Study